

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 28th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Member for River Heights.

MR. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (River Heights): I wish to present the petition of the Garment Manufacturers and Employees Fund, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Garment Manufacturers and Employees Fund.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of Keith Turner, Praying for the passing of An Act for the relief of Clifford Junghans, Henry Junghans, Albert Chesick and Harvey Chesick.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.  
Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 37, an Act respecting Industrial-Talcott Financial Ltd.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone) in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. George, introduced Bill No. 42, an Act to incorporate the Elizabeth M. Crowe Memorial Hospital.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 52, an Act for the relief of Mytro Mandybura.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon) introduced Bill No. 53, an Act to incorporate Providence Ste. Therese.

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 65, an Act respecting C.A.C. Realty Limited.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 66, an Act respecting Niagara Mortgage & Loan Company Limited.

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 75, an Act respecting The Central Trust Company of Canada; and Bill No. 76, an Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Art Gallery.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 79, an Act to amend "An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts incorporating 'The Fidelity Trust Company'."

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an address by the Honourable Member for St. George voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on March 15th, 1963; and, as well, a Return to an Order of the House No. 7, dated March 27th, 1963 on motion of the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye. Madam Speaker, I should also like, while on my feet and with leave of the House, to make a short announcement regarding reciprocity.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I thought the House should be the first to know that yesterday I signed, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, reciprocity with respect to transportation agreements with the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. These agreements were sent yesterday to the respective Ministers in those two provinces for final initialling by them, they having already executed the agreement. The agreements are on the same general basis as that executed some months ago with the Province of Ontario. I thought the House should have this information at this time.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, following on the statement of the Minister, all I can say is that if he had signed them a year ago when he should have, the province would have been that much further ahead.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, there is a member in the House that is wearing a white carnation, the Honourable Member from Swan River. I would like the members of the Legislature to join with me in wishing them well on their 25th wedding anniversary and wishing and hoping that they celebrate the next 25 years -- their 50th wedding anniversary.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, in rising to acknowledge this tribute, I need hardly say that 25 years ago today it went beyond my wildest dreams that I would be sitting in this august Assembly. Life with its trials and tribulations met head on,

(Mr. Bilton, cont'd) . . . . and for the most part overcome, have its rewards. Life's joys too, Madam have memories we cherish. Without my wife at my side these past 25 years, Madam Speaker, things I am sure, would have just been that much more difficult. For her help and understanding, I am very very grateful. On her behalf and on behalf of myself, I accept the tributes paid to us today with the deepest gratitude. Thank you very much.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to make a correct in Hansard. On page 700 of the Hansard No.29, Tuesday evening last, I am quoted as saying, and I read the whole sentence: "I think that you're flirting with serious trouble if you establish a lagoon on an area where the soil is poor." Now, Madam Speaker, this happened to be the soil around Portage la Prairie that I was speaking of and anyone who has any information on the subject at all knows that that is the best land in the world and that poor land is almost unknown. So might I correct that word "poor" -- it is not the one that I used -- and see that it's changed to the proper word of "porous" -- p-o-r-o-u-s. My guess is that my pronunciation was not too good at the time, but I would not want to be held guilty of suggesting that there was poor land around Portage la Prairie.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.  
Orders for Return.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: the estimated cost of construction of the bridge and approaches to be constructed over the Floodway as part of PTH 59 just south of Bird's Hill; the estimated cost of construction of a bridge and approaches at the site which is north of Bird's Hill in near proximity to Garvin Avenue; the reasons for locating this bridge as presently intended in preference to locating it northeast of the village in close proximity to Garvin Avenue.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I rise to say that I can't accept this particular Order for Return owing to the fact that we do not give out the engineering estimates on any of our projects. As far as the merits and demerits of the proposed location are concerned, I think that they might better be discussed probably during my estimates. I would be quite happy to discuss them in detail at that time.

MR. SCHREYER: With that undertaking, Madam Speaker, I'm quite satisfied to have the Order turned down.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to withdraw the motion? --  
Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, on speaking on Bill No.39, it is not my intention to deny other members the right of an increase or a proper measure of remuneration for their work on behalf of the people of the province, nor to imply, or leave the implication that members have a selfish interest by supporting the Bill for an increase in their indemnity. It's a matter for the members themselves to evaluate the work that they are doing; the time and effort spent, both in and outside the House; and arrive at a satisfactory figure to recompense for their time spent in the effort put forward. However, it seems to me, whether we want to or not, we are admitting, in part, through this measure, the devaluation or the worth of a dollar by proposing an increase in the indemnity. If this is so, we should make every effort to extend like provisions to the old and needy and to those making an honest living, that their endeavours and efforts are being rewarded favourably as well.

I think a good deal could be said in this respect. I'm sure all of us would like to see a more prosperous economy and that people would not have to spend their future income on present-day necessities, but could make greater use of the abundance of goods available without having to resort to greater indebtedness, and that more purchasing power be made available to the individual to solve the problem of distribution. I think this is quite evident.

My objection to the Bill is not to deny the members of a just reward but to register a protest to the government for not providing, in an equal measure and on an equal basis, an opportunity for the boys and girls in non-division school districts to acquire a proper education

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)..... in order to make a fair living. That is so essential to the present day and their future lives, where they will be facing ever-increasing challenges and more competition in order to make a fair living. Further in protesting, by failing to provide the necessary and equal teacher and capital school grants that are available to division schools but denied to non-division school districts to make it possible to give them this education.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, on a point of Order, I believe that we are debating the second reading of the Bill with respect to the amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act. I, for one, fail to see what relevancy there is to the question that is now being debated by my honourable friend.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that he try to keep his remarks closely to what is before us here, the Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I feel that by increasing the indemnity for ourselves, I think we should be considering others as well and that's why I'm bringing up this matter. I feel very strongly about the harm that we're doing to these people in not giving them the necessary tools for their future life. Madam Speaker, I think it is unwise to support the measure that is before us until such time as some of the iniquities carried on have been eliminated or corrected.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I wish to put on record my opposition to this proposed increase. While I'm opposed to this across-the-board increase to all members of the Legislature, I approve of the idea of larger grants for the persons in the two northern constituencies of Churchill and Rupertsland because they must have much greater expenses in looking after their constituency. I also approve of the idea that went through this Legislature two or three years ago whereby extra allowances were given to those members who have to be away from home when they are attending this Legislature; and I think that there are likely representatives of other constituencies, perhaps not so far north as Churchill, that should get something extra, and perhaps representatives of other constituencies where the constituencies are very large and they have extra work and trouble and expense in looking after the needs of their constituents.

I think that the present indemnity is enough. I think that it was shown by the fact that there were lots of candidates in the last provincial election when the indemnity was at the present figure. I think, too, we should have regard to the thousands of men and women who give freely of their time in public service in Manitoba without any rewards -- members of service clubs; members of political organizations; church organizations; members of various organizations that help out as hospitals and so on. So I think that, in view of the public service that is given by so many, that our reward should be kept to a reasonable amount.

The Honourable Member for St. John's said that we shouldn't be encouraging too many to come into the Legislature who look to the indemnity as their main source of livelihood or their only source of livelihood, and if we increase it further we will be increasing the chances and be increasing the possibilities that more will be coming to the Legislature who think of the Legislature indemnity as being for their livelihood.

The Honourable Member for Inkster pointed out that when he first ran for public office he ran because he wished to be of public service and there was no indemnity, nothing paid for the position that he obtained at that time. I think that that is the point, that is the position that we would hope that most people would take, that they stand for office because they wish to be of some public service and not because of the money involved. The higher we raise our indemnities, the more likely it is that that person will perhaps run for public office because of the money that they might obtain rather than because of the public service that they might give.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I might just make a few remarks in closing this particular debate. Unfortunately, I regret that I was not able yesterday to be present to listen to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside with respect to this matter as I am certain that he made a thoughtful contribution toward our discussion on this subject, though I'm equally certain that I would not likely agree with the line of argument that he presented.

This question of the indemnity of Members of a Legislature, or of any representative body of this kind, is a perplexing one because there is no absolute standard to which we can refer.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... This is a question of judgment; this is a question of opinion; and it has the added disadvantage that we are required to exercise our opinion and to express our judgment in a matter in which we obviously have a direct interest as we are the people who are receiving the money that is to be paid in this connection and one can obviously see the invidious position in which we are placed.

I think one has to first of all make up one's mind whether there should be any indemnities at all when dealing with this matter. There was a time in the history of our parliamentary institutions when no indemnities were paid, that the honour and the responsibility of discharging one's task as a legislator was considered to be adequate under the circumstances, by means of inducement and reward for men who offered themselves to public life and it was considered a little bit disreputable to suggest that one should be paid for discharging such a high public responsibility. I am one of those who believe that the question of an indemnity today has absolutely nothing to do with the decision of the vast majority of people who offer themselves for public office. Certainly if one refers to the indemnities that are paid in this House, because in the context of modern society and in the context of modern income the indemnities that are offered here are not such as, in my opinion, would induce very many people to run for office for the sake of the indemnity. It is possible that there may be some of that character who do run, but I am satisfied that there are very few of that character who get elected, and it seems to me that we may dismiss from our minds the thought that men or women might run for this particular Legislature for the monetary reward that may be offered.

It is, of course, true that some members make a little contribution to the government of their province -- and when I say little contribution I'm not thinking in terms of what is said here, the number of speeches made or the time consumed. There are some members, I fear, who consume a great deal of time and who make a great many speeches whose contribution is less than that offered by other members who are relatively silent. But in application to one's responsibilities, in consideration of the public problems, in one's attitude toward the constituents that one represents and to the province as a whole, it is in that sphere as well that we must look for the contribution that men in public life make to the welfare of their province and the well-being of their fellow citizens. So it must be admitted that there is a difference between the contribution that various men or women bring to the deliberations of this House. I think it must be admitted there is some whose contribution is small and some whose contribution is great; and, therefore, it is a difficult matter to say what any particular representative or any particular Legislature should settle on as an adequate indemnity.

I think the purpose of the indemnity is not to provide an alternative living for somebody, but it is rather to provide for reasonable and necessary expenses which they undertake or sacrifices that they make in respect to carrying on their duties and carrying on their responsibilities. It is by no means wages. It is what it says -- an indemnity -- and I think for a good many members of the House it is an indemnity which is properly payable to them. I take the view that the amount of the indemnity is a difficult thing indeed for us to settle upon. That an indemnity should be paid at all is, in my mind, a right. There should be an indemnity because it has been found in the past, and I think it is true today, that there are some good men and women who would not be able to offer themselves for public life at all if it weren't for the fact that this particular recognition was made of the financial obligations involved and some attention paid to their needs in this respect; and that in the operation of a democracy where we want to make it possible for people of every social strata -- if there is such a thing in our country -- certainly people of any economic strata, who have a contribution to make and who can convince their fellow citizens that they should represent them, should be able to do so in the Legislature with a certain amount of dignity in respect of their financial considerations. So I conclude that an indemnity is a good thing in respect of democracy and it's a good thing that we have them in this House.

The question before us is what should that indemnity be. There, of course, is where the area of judgment and, may I say, of prejudice -- because I think in my opinion it can be prejudice in some instances -- this is the area where judgment and prejudice and personal opinion come into account. I have to admit that we are entitled, each one of us, to take our view on this and it is no disrespect to any member that he thinks it should be higher or he thinks it should be lower. Those are all within the area of judgment to which I think we would all

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd).... subscribe. I should say, though, that as far as the government is concerned, we do not consider that this is a government measure. This is a measure which I am introducing in my capacity as Leader of the House, on behalf of all the members, for their debate and their consideration. Do not regard it essentially as a Party matter. I certainly do not regard it as a matter of confidence so far as the government is concerned and I say that, speaking for my own Party, I feel that all members on this side of the House are entitled to vote as they wish on this matter without any inhibitions from the government whatsoever. So let it be quite clear that I respect the right of each member to conduct himself as he sees fit on this matter.

Let me come back then to the question of money -- the amount that is to be paid. The indemnity at the present time is \$4,000 a year. The proposal is that it should be raised to \$4,800, which is an increase of \$800. I think the members might like to be reminded of the basis on which that sum was arrived at. It has to be admitted that it is entirely .....; there is no formula; even comparisons are difficult in arriving at it, but I think I might say that basically it has been arrived at by comparing that sum with what is considered reasonable in other Legislatures throughout the country. I think I gave the members the figures on that the other day and it might bear repetition. In Alberta today it is \$4,500 indemnity -- there are some other expense allowances in some provinces but I'll deal with indemnities only -- \$4,500 in Alberta; \$4,400 in British Columbia; \$5,000 in New Brunswick; \$5,000 in Newfoundland; \$4,800 in Nova Scotia; \$7,000 in Ontario; \$9,700 in the Province of Quebec; and \$6,000 in the Province of Saskatchewan. So it would seem that this suggestion is not out of line when compared with what other provinces do, and that must be a matter of some comfort for those who propose to vote in favour, because it, I think, indicates that we are not extending the proposition too greatly when we suggest that it be raised to a figure of \$4,800, which is lower even today than most other jurisdictions in Canada and certainly compares favourably indeed, or let me say compares on the low side with the average that is paid across the country.

So there we have it, Madam Speaker. This is a simple question. It is one which I think will involve emotions outside this House to quite an extent. I must say that some members may attempt to use this as a means of arousing some feeling on the part of members of the general public that we are indeed being greedy or asking for too much for ourselves when we propose this suggestion, but I really don't think that many will take that tack, that most, even though they oppose the measure, will deal with it on its merits rather than any other basis. So, Madam Speaker, I think that that's about all that can be said on this matter of raising the indemnities some \$800.00. While I propose to vote in favour of it myself, I do so because I think that is the general sentiment of the House. It's been canvassed in other quarters beside government quarters, but I recognize on the other hand the right of any member, wherever he sits, to dissent from the proposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, before my honourable friend fully closes the debate, I'd like to ask him just what he means by that comment that some members might be opposing this for the purpose of arousing some feeling of the general public?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I make no reference in that thought to my honourable friend. I merely remember the experience of the past when on other occasions, and I believe he happened to be the Premier at that particular moment when a salary increase was proposed and it was used by some members -- I think some in my own party if I am to be frank about it -- in a manner which I certainly thought was improper on that occasion and I draw on that experience; but let my honourable friend rest assured that I make no such reference in connection with his views on this subject.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Madam Speaker, I have a point of order to raise which I would like you to consider or the First Minister or any other qualified expert on the rules. I just wonder how we are going to contrive in this situation when our rules explicitly state "that no member shall vote upon a matter in which he has a direct pecuniary interest."

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think I can set my honourable friend's mind at rest on the point of order. We'll simply follow the precedent that was established when he was the Premier.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's an excellent precedent, and I notice that my honourable friend has been following it regularly.

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

MR. ROBLIN: May we have a recorded vote, Madam Speaker -- yeas and nays.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Desjardins, Evans, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Wright, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Campbell, Cowan, Froese.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 48; Nays, 3.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Second Reading Bill No. 19. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, again with your permission and leave of the House, I would ask this stand until the other Bill which is a companion measure is before us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Bill No. 40. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 40, an Act to amend The Soldier's Taxation Relief Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the subject was covered pretty thoroughly at the Committee stage and I have nothing further to add at this moment.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, with your permission and with leave of the House, I would ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second Reading of Bill No. 46. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 46, an Act to amend The Winter Employment Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, this amendment clarifies the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to contribute in whole or in part to approved winter works projects.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me really that there's something more than what the Minister indicates in the Bill. I think he could give us a more detailed explanation, in particular to the section with regards to unorganized territory. He could proceed there to give us the reasons why this is being introduced and exactly how far he intends to go in this matter; how it will be apportioned between different unorganized territories; where the requests must come from; and all the details involved. As we all know, in the unorganized territories there is not the local government, or in most of them in fact no local committee to make the request for these works, so in final analysis it's really the government who has to make the decisions and this can lead then to a situation where there isn't an apportionment between the different local government districts. For those of us in particular who have local government district areas in our constituencies, this can be a very important section. I really believe that the Minister should give us a more detailed explanation of the intent of the Bill and how it is going to be handled by the government. I appreciate it's going to be a little difficult for him at this stage, having made his statement.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, maybe I could say a word on this subject. The former Act did not allow us, to begin with, to enter into agreements with local government districts and then enable the province to make payments to the local government districts. These amendments enable government to be able to pay over to the local government district that portion which would normally go to the municipality. The federal agreement also said that in areas where there was not a local government, that a committee should be established and that the government should work through a local committee.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd)... These committees were established in two or three districts in the province during the last year and certain works have been undertaken in these areas. Now because of the lack of local funds, they were not always able to provide the money which was required for equipment and things of that kind so we have made provision for the government to pay more than what would normally be paid to a municipality, which applies only to wages, but did enable them to take into account such things as equipment, transportation and things of that kind which would be required with respect to the winter works project. I'd just like to say this is merely enabling us to do some of the things in those areas which were not covered by The Winter Employment Act before and will enable us to do more work in areas such as the Leader of the Opposition is interested in.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, my reading of that Bill doesn't -- Section 2, (9) (a) (1), and the other subsections of (9) (a) do not refer to the unorganized territory but to those portions of unorganized territories where there is no local government district. If I understood the Honourable Minister who just spoke, he seemed to indicate that the amendments were to cover the unorganized territories.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I have a message from His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the said message, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we are now distributing copies of these Supplementary Estimates and I think if members will allow me to go through them with them, they will find that there is little or nothing of an unusual character here, and that it would be possible to proceed with them this afternoon. If that is found to be the case, I would propose that we move as far as second reading of the Supplementary Supply Bill; and also of the Interim Supply Bill, by leave, in view of the time of the year at which we arrive; and we can proceed with second reading and probably third reading, by leave tomorrow, if that meets the approval of the House. So on that assumption, Mr. Chairman, I'll do my best to explain the Supplementary Estimates to the satisfaction of the Committee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to proceeding with this, although as the Minister has indicated, most of these are not large sums. They're very small, in fact compared to last year, they're substantially smaller in total as well. There are only two large amounts under the Welfare Department. Normally I would ask the Minister to give us at least a day's notice, but on this occasion I'm prepared to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislation, Item 1 -- passed. Item 2, Other Assembly Expenditures -- passed. The Executive Council, Item 1 -- passed. Item 6 -- passed. The Provincial Secretary, Item 1...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, Item 6. On this one there is a fairly substantial change there. It would seem to me that we would know in advance wouldn't we, what we would have to pay out in interest? Was there a substantial change during the course of the year in the trust funds?

MR. ROBLIN: The variable factor here is the amount of cash that is entrusted to us in the trust funds and upon which interest must be paid. There's really no way of being sure how much cash will be given to us by the various people for whom we manage these funds, except

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... on the record of past experience, and this year we got more cash. A substantial increase was held in trust over what previously was the case, which boosted the interest we have to pay on these various funds. It's really not an item that one can control very closely.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable the First Minister says, "from people who entrust us with finds" -- I'm not quite clear on that.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend will recall that there are a large number of statutes in which public bodies, let us say the Hospital Plan, or the Agricultural Credit Fund, or the Industrial Development Fund have monies that are advanced to them or that they receive from various sources. When they can't use that money at once they're not allowed to hold on to it. They must return it to the Provincial Treasury where we manage it and get interest on it and pay them interest. There is a very wide variety of trust accounts of this sort. My honourable friend will find them all listed in the Public Accounts if he wants the details of the type of trusts, but this is a thing that is quite normal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 (1) -- passed, 5 -- passed. 6...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, both 5 and 6 -- under these the government estimates in advance what it expects, on the basis I presume of whatever experience we've had in the past -- on an actuarial basis, the amount that has to be put in. Does this indicate that the experience throughout the course of the year had not been as favourable? That is, have we had actually more people die, for example, than have to put out under the Group Life Insurance Plan, or does it indicate that there has been an increase in staff, and that this has meant a greater contribution.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I don't think either of those two items are the real cause for these changes. The fact is that under The Superannuation Act, if you get premature retirements for example, it increases the demand on the fund. It so happens that we had a number of unforeseen premature retirements which were, as far as I'm aware, at the will of the person concerned, which meant that they began to draw on the fund sooner than had been estimated and that accounts for that increase.

In respect to the Civil Service Group Life Insurance, the increase here is due to salary adjustments, which is a small portion, and payment of the government portion of the April, 1962, premiums that were originally considered as an expenditure of the previous fiscal year. What happened was that when the estimates for last year were made up, most of this money was thought to be included in the fiscal year 1961-62. It turned out that it wasn't 1962-63, therefore, the sum is required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5 -- passed; 6 -- passed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand how a government could underestimate on salary. It's true the amount involved isn't very much, but I would like to ask the First Minister if the supplementary supply for salary in these four different departments is strictly for part-time help -- hire that wasn't foreseen?

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend wants me to go back, there is \$800 under administration. This is due to a sickness relief not provided in the estimates and a leave of absence that was granted for some purpose. Where is the next one that you want to know about? -- (Interjection) -- Agriculture. Well this was the cost of running the Vegetable Marketing vote. This \$300 was required for extra help. That, of course, could not be anticipated. In the salaries later on under -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's what that's for. Coming to the Attorney-General, this sum of \$750 is the payment required in lieu of vacation on the retirement of the Administrator of the Estates. He was entitled to four weeks leave and he asked to work the four weeks and be paid instead, and therefore his salary is up. I'll deal with any other salary items as we come to it if my honourable friend wishes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VI, Item 7 -- passed. Department VII, Attorney-General. Item 9 -- passed. Department VIII, Health. Item 1 --

MR. MOLGAT: There is a substantial increase in this one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBLIN: In the item here, Mr. Chairman, is some \$20,000 for the expansion of rural physiotherapy programs to provide services to small rural hospitals and home-care patients.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 -- passed. Department XI, Public Works. Item 1,

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd)... Administration --

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the item on postage is mailing of additional validation strips and increase in postage from other departments. Members will recall that the post office operates for the whole government and they try to estimate the amount of mail they are going to get from the other departments, and if they get more mail than they expect the postage bill goes up. That's what happened. The main item in here -- there's a sum of \$5,000 for the mailing of the cheques for welfare which formerly were done by the Department of Welfare themselves. This was switched to the Department of Public Works which normally does the mailing, and I think it's the proper thing for them to do, so they got left with the bill and that's why that's in there.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): That means then, Mr. Chairman, \$7,000 for other departments in the overall mailing. I wonder how much of this could be attributed to the fact of an election being held in December.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 -- passed; 4 --

MR. PAULLEY: I'll rephrase that. Where was the other \$7,000 used?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, apart from what I told my honourable friend about mailing the welfare cheques and an increased sum for mailing the automobile validation strips, it's not stated here. The rest is from all departments of the government. I really cannot undertake to be any more explicit because the amount of time involved in finding out -- indeed no one keeps a record who mails what letters but the general suggestion that my honourable friend is trying to convey that, in some way or another the government used its mailing fund to promote its cause in the provincial general election, I think he just suggested it in a humorous manner because I'm sure nobody really thinks that happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 -- passed. Department of Welfare. Item 1 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that was Item 1 we were on, I believe. Wasn't it? Under 4 (h) there's a very substantial increase here. Now the total appropriation last year was \$276,000 and we're adding \$50,000, which represents percentage-wise a very large change. I wonder if the Minister could indicate why this was done?

MR. ROBLIN: In 1962-63, this item appeared for the first time and it was an estimate of what had been spent on this particular work, because it previously hadn't been sorted out with any great degree of exactitude. We decided it should be done separately and so it was shown separately, but as a result of the experience of the year's operations we found that the estimate that was previously set out for this was not sufficient for the job. It's simply a matter of gaining experience in this particular category of expenditure.

MR. MOLGAT: .....then by an increase in the need for maintenance. It was mainly an accounting distribution within the department?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I believe that's the case.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, it's a new amount -- it's something new here -- a new program. Does that mean it'll be inspection and repairs of ferries?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid that gardens come under the direction of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 -- passed. Department XV, Welfare. Item 1 -- passed; 2 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, here again there's a very ...

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, under Welfare, \$362,600. This represents payments made to municipalities for municipal welfare costs. One of our problems here is that the municipal financial year and our financial year don't coincide and, as a result, we don't get the bill from the municipalities for our share which is 60 percent above one mill or, alternately, there is a formula which I just haven't got at the tip of my tongue -- 40-80 -- 40-60 and 20-80 are the two formulas employed and members will be familiar with them. The trouble is we can't tell when we make up our estimate what they're going to ask us for because of the difference in timing between their statements and our budget. We take a guess at it and this year our guess was out by \$362,600.

MR. MOLGAT: Would that not indicate though, Mr. Chairman, a very substantial actual increase? Last year in the regular estimates we had planned for an increase of some \$332,000 just in the regular estimate, and it turns out that during the course of the year we've

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... also had to put out an additional \$362,000. In other words, almost \$700,000 increase in the course of the year. Could the Minister explain why this has been such a very substantial increase in the period of one year.? We went up from \$1.4 million to actually a total of some \$2.1 million.

MR. ROBLIN: This does present a bit of a conundrum at first glance. There are a couple of points that I'd like to make in connection with it and that is the money that we are paying this year to the municipalities is for six months of their last fiscal year in 1961, so in our estimating of this time last year, we're trying to estimate what the last six months welfare costs are going to be, just as this year we're trying to estimate in our budget what the last six months welfare costs will be for the municipalities of last year. You get that carried forward and you simply can't tell what it's going to be -- it's up or down. I don't think that it relates closely to the problem of unemployment because we know that in '62 we had a very favourable employment picture in the province rather than the reverse, but in '61 there was heavy unemployment and this money, or a good deal of it, goes to pay the last six months of '61 to the municipalities. Now of course they don't have to wait for this. They get paid, but ultimately the government must come to the Legislature and have the fund replenished.

MR. PAULLEY: There is just one comment that I would make on this, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable the First Minister made reference to unemployment in '61, but I think that if he will peruse the reports that have been published insofar as municipal corporations are concerned, that their welfare costs have gone up in the calendar year 1962 as well, and in many reports it seems that this is attributed to the fact of increased burdens as the result of unemployment in the year 1962 as well as those of 1961.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2 -- passed. Item 3 --

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there is another large item that members will like to know about in respect to Old Age Assistance. Last year there was an underestimate of the average cost per person that would be required to meet this particular requirement. The trouble was that there was an increase, as people know, in the pension scales at that time. The estimates were made up long before that happened, therefore we underestimated what we would be paying out on that account. So that explains that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Interim Estimates.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would now ask the Committee to consider the Interim Estimates as well. We are now asking for one-tenth of the budget. It used to be one-twelfth but I think they've changed it to one-tenth, Mr. Clerk. Would you have a look and see? One-sixth-- Oh, I'm out -- One-sixth. We're asking for one-sixth for this two months -- in other words, instead of one month -- of the estimates that are before the Legislature at the present time. This is merely to make provision to pay the bills after March 31st when our present authority runs out, and is a customary resolution at this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$20,758,672, being one-sixth of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1964, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if this is taken to indicate that we're going to be here a full two months, maybe I should revise my position about that salary.

MR. ROBLIN: I say that the members of the Opposition will decide how long the House sits. I might say, as a matter of fact, if it would not be considered out of order, that the Province of British Columbia prorogued yesterday after sitting 45 days, the longest on their record.

MR. PAULLEY: .....insofar as road contracts and the likes of that, that might have been the reason for the extension of the length of time in British Columbia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Morris, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I think the question was not put. Don't we have to wait for that, or are we all right -- Well, we're all right.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,900 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1963. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,100 for Executive Council for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1963. (3) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$19,000 for Treasury for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1963.

(4) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$17,600 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963. (5) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$600 for Agriculture and Conservation for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1963. (6) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,350 for Attorney-General for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1963. (7) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,000 for Health for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963. (8) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$87,000 for Public Works for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1963. (9) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$437,275 for Welfare for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1963. Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$20,758, 672, being one-sixth of the amount of the several items to be voted for the departments as set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, the sum of \$589,825 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution be adopted? -- Agreed.

Resolution 2. Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses for the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, the sum of \$20,758, 672, being one-sixth of the amount of several items voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, laid before the House the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of Consolidated Funds. Resolution be adopted? -- Agreed.

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, the the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, the sum of \$589,825 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd) . . . certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, the sum of \$20,758,672, being one-sixth of the amount of the several items voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 69, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963; and, Bill No. 59, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if there is no objection, I think we might proceed by leave, to finish the whole procedure this afternoon. So I move, by leave -- this is where "by leave" does come in -- I move, by leave, that Bill No. 69, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, be now read a second time.

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

MR. ROBLIN, by leave, presented Bill No. 59, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister without portfolio, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills No. 59 and 69.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved into a Committee of the Whole, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if we will just wait until the pages have distributed the Bill, I think then we should proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: We have no objections, Mr. Chairman, if it's done elsewhere, to consider Bill No. 69. I understand it is 59 that is now being distributed.

Bill No. 69 and Bill No. 59 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills No. 59 and 69 were read a third time, by leave, and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Health.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the order will be, following the disposition of these estimates which I trust will be passed shortly, Mines and Natural Resources will be next, to be followed by Agriculture.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the First Minister for the advance notice on this. It simplifies our work considerably when we know.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Before we get on, I did promise to look up the answers to the questions from the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains re these statistics as shown on page 26, re Brandon and Dauphin. My remarks last night were partly correct in that both these hospitals were undergoing their renovation projects in that year that these statistics are shown here. Prior to November '61, for example, Dauphin had 63 rated beds with 86 set up. During the 11 months they were operating in the old hospital, on

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd)... rated bed capacity they had a high utilization, 95 percent and 70 percent when you take the beds that were set up -- that is 86 beds -- and then the renovation of the older building began and, at the end of '61, the hospital had 84 of the 104 new beds. During '62, of course, this renovation program has been completed and the new hospital now has set up 92 out of a rated 104, and then there's the balance of future expansion. The specific answers that -- of course the extended treatment hospital approved there for 35 beds is now operating and this is meant to provide extended treatment facilities in that area of a 30 mile to 40 mile radius. So the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains can tell his good folks that. The new born rates -- the 9.1 figure here for 1961 hasn't been repeated before or after that particular year and it is unusual, but I would just point out to the committee that, on the basis of these statistics and so on, when the consultants pay visits to the hospital, they look into these various aspects of the operations and discuss them with the chiefs of the different departments. I thought I would pass that information on.

With respect to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, I think the figure of \$10.2 million of last year and \$10.6 million, as in the sheets I passed around, are the actual payments made to the Provincial Treasury, and this is checked, of course, by the Comptroller-General. But this is the cash actually that was sent over in the past year and the \$10.6 million is the anticipated amount for the coming year.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the explanation he's given me, but I'm not altogether satisfied with it. If we turn back to the annual report which was put on our tables this session, we'll go over the figures again given for Dauphin. The rated bed capacity here is 104; beds and cribs set up, 84; and the percent occupancy is 57.63 on the basis of those figures -- on the rated bed capacity. Now we're told that the rated bed capacity of that hospital should have been shown as 63 on the actual usage which would give us 95 percent occupancy. Well I'm sorry to say that neither of these figures are correct. We had a hospital in Dauphin with a rated bed capacity of 63, according to this memo, and the figures that the Honourable Minister just gave us. We added 104, so actually the Dauphin Hospital should be rated at a 167, and if you rate it on that and you work out your percentage basis of occupancy on the rated bed capacity of the hospital as it is now, the number of patients that were in that hospital in 1961 would give you a percent occupancy of only 36 percent. So I repeat what I said yesterday. Was that extension justified? We have increased -- we've tripled almost the necessary bed capacity from a 36 percent user to a 100 percent, and I want to point out to the Honourable Minister that from these reports we can see that there are a great many hospitals in the Province of Manitoba that are being overtaxed that doesn't seem to have been given the same consideration as Dauphin has.

Now in my opinion it's a nice thing to have a large hospital, but it certainly doesn't warrant the expenditure we've made in Dauphin where you have a capacity so large you may not be using it for the next 25 or 30 years, when there are communities without any hospital and communities that have asked for a hospital at an expense of around \$200,000, which the Honourable Minister didn't seem to think it was warranted; and yet he turns around and spends a tremendous amount of money on the hospital which did not warrant that extension, according to the figures of his department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in looking back at last year's report from the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan, we see on page 19 -- and I'll read from this report on page 19 as follows: "Dauphin General Hospital. A new hospital providing 104 active treatment beds and costing \$1,485,000 completed in November, 1961. The renovation of the existing hospital is now underway." Just a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, I saw the figure of \$1,750,000 as the cost of this hospital, and according to this report and what is actually going on in the Dauphin Hospital, they are still making renovations. Could the Honourable Minister tell the committee what the actual cost has been in Dauphin to date, and what does he estimate the balance of the cost will be before that hospital is complete?

MR. JOHNSON: I'd certainly be glad to get that information, but I am just trying to indicate to my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains that we took an antiquated old hospital that had been allowed almost to go to rubble and ruin, and had to pack beds in there to the extent of 86 beds in a facility that could only be rated as 63. Finally, working with that community and with the resources of the Hospital Plan at this key centre in the province -- and

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) . . . . during the course of the Willard Report, as you recall, this became rather urgent and had to be approved before the Willard study had been completed -- and during the study when the hospital was in operation and beginning to be renovated and a proper modern hospital developed to modern hospital standards, a rated bed capacity of 104 was determined. At that point, it was also decided that with the resources in that facility of surgery, X-ray, laboratory and X-ray services and so on, to make maximum use of the present old facility, if it could be renovated properly, that this would make and be an economical venture to create an extended treatment hospital in this area of the province.

Now I don't know what interpretation -- my honourable friend can put any interpretation he wants on the statistics -- but to me they show this: over-utilization, in short, of the old, out-moded facility, which gives a false picture of the percentage occupancy and so on. In other words, the statistics don't state too much, but they give the false impression. At the present time there are 104 rated beds in the new facility and there was planned a 35-bed extended treatment hospital for that area of the province.

As you recall, the Survey Board Report indicated that we should create throughout the province, as pilot projects, these extended treatment hospitals adjacent and part of the acute treatment hospitals throughout the areas to see if this wasn't part of our solution to the extended treatment and chronic care problem. At the present time, the utilization of that hospital is very maximum. It drains a large area of that part of Manitoba. I haven't got statistics in front of me, but I've been to that hospital and I've seen it operating. It is being used, not to maximum capacity at the moment, but it can be. As I indicated in the note here, some of the wards can contain five-bed units; they've now got four beds in them. There is a little room for expansion and this facility has been planned with an eye to the future. I understand, and from everyone I can talk to in the Standards Division, it is now an opportunity for this hospital to show a performance which will improve the statistics of the past. I don't know what else I can say about the matter.

As I indicated earlier in this session, acute hospital beds of the kind produced at Dauphin -- I haven't got the exact figures but I'll be glad to get the total cost. Oh, I think I have the total cost here somewhere when it's built. Modern hospital construction is expensive. The extended treatment section, where you don't have the duplication of these high cost facilities, of course is not as costly as that. Oh, I can get the actual figures on Dauphin later on. I didn't think they were out of line the last time I saw them. I haven't got those precise figures here with me, I'm sorry, but I can get the cost of the acute section of 104 beds and the cost of the extended treatment section of 35 beds, where the town and the municipality put up the local equity. I imagine these total costs can be released or are known at this time.

**MR. HRYHORCZUK:** When the Honourable Minister is getting the figures that he mentioned, would he also get an estimate on what the ultimate cost will be after the old building is renovated?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, a while back the Honourable Minister spoke of home-care. I wanted to make sure of what he said and I read Hansard again, and I'd like to ask him at this time if he could give us, if possible, a more precise policy -- a complete policy of the government on this home-care. At the moment I think that the Winnipeg General Hospital is proceeding with this service of hospital centred home-care. Quite a while back the St. Boniface General Hospital was asked to study the possible home-care program and it did this. Apparently it's all set to go and they haven't heard from the Commission for quite a while. I wonder if they will be asked soon to go ahead with this program or will the General Hospital be asked to discontinue their part of this program.

I was surprised and interested to notice this comment by the Honourable Minister at the time that they were not -- after a trip to New York to study this plan that they have there -- the Commission was not too impressed. I wonder if at this time the Honourable Minister would mind telling us if it's known at this time what the policy of the government will be on this home-care. I think it would help.

**MR. JOHNSON:** The home-care program has been going forward at the General. Before extending future home-care programs, we asked the Commission to look into the various factors which have developed in recent years, in the last year or two, as to how far you go with home-care situations. As I indicated in the House, two administrators plus members of

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) . . . . the Commission have made a recent study of another home-care program in another jurisdiction to get some new ideas, and we are awaiting the report of two members of this committee to report to the Commission as to the factors which the Commission wish to discuss further. We are very keen on home-care programs, but the extent to which these should be hospital-based and the extent to which they should be community-based is something we want to underline in the near future.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I would not like to start this discussion without again reiterating the fact that the Hospital Commission Services now being provided are a tremendous stride forward in the development of the health program of this province and indeed as it is in many of the provinces of Canada. I think we must always recognize that we have made this tremendous stride and look forward to more and more strides in the field of health and in the field of education, if I may say that without being out of order.

Now there are a few matters, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to bring up. One is again referring to the Table to which the Honourable Member from Ethelbert-Plains referred, and not in detail at all but only to indicate that, in reading this Table, I note the vast discrepancy between various hospitals in occupancy. I don't intend to deal with it. I don't know enough about it to deal with it, except to accept at this point the Minister's statement that consultants, in their review of hospital administration with the hospitals, deal with this matter. I should think they would; I should think it would have a lot to do with the administration, with the doctors that see patients in and out of these hospitals with their attempts to clear beds for use of other patients who may be waiting for it. I hope that the Minister will be able to enlighten me to some extent as to the number of consultants there are and as to the time that they give for the work that they are doing and whether there is sufficient provision made for an adequate coverage of the entire field of occupancy of the beds in the hospitals.

Incidentally, there is another question that I hoped I could get answered in turn, and that is whether any of these hospitals under this plan are privately-owned, having charters that are other than non-profit. I think there was a time when hospitals could be owned and operated by persons who were independent in their operation of it and who could conceivably make a profit out of hospitals, and I'd like to know if there are still any such.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to refer back to an occasion last Monday when I had an opportunity to speak on the entire estimates of this department and when I dealt amongst other matters with the cost of drugs. I dealt with that briefly and I dealt with it in an over-simplified manner which, as a result, has created a misunderstanding to some extent of what I said or intended to say, which misunderstanding was assisted by a report which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune last Tuesday and which gave me credit for making a statement that "Doctors are so busy making money they forget the service they owe to their patients," etcetera, etcetera.

Well, I was rather shocked by the statement which I was purported to have made, and I took the trouble to check Hansard on page 621 where I did say that "the trouble is that so many doctors are so busy these days and making lots of money while they're doing it, that they don't take the trouble to find" etcetera, etcetera. To me there is a distinction and I did want to clarify, Mr. Chairman, that I had no intention of suggesting that doctors are so concerned with the monetary returns that they are not concerned with the interests of their patients. It is not for me to have to defend the standing of the medical profession in this province or indeed in this world, and the respect that they command is evidence enough of the fact that it is recognized that the contribution they make is unparalleled in terms of working for the interests of their patients in particular and health in general.

Nevertheless, I did make the statement, and I do believe the statement. Well I did make the statement that they're making lots of money. I think that's true and I don't begrudge it to them. I think that they are getting a return for a service which they do not deny people in a 24-hour day. But I also made the statement that I felt that something should be done with doctors to encourage them to look at the cost of drugs they prescribe. I did not suggest that they ought not to prescribe drugs which their patients cannot pay. Certainly the question of the cost of drugs should never enter into the question of whether or not a patient can afford them. If the drugs are necessary, they are necessary; and to that extent, if they are too costly for the patient, the government, I believe, has a task to perform.

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

I think that the Honourable Minister agrees with that, because in dealing also with the same subject he pointed out in Hansard of page 597, "that there are three approaches to the problem" and mentioned them as being "the medical profession, the pharmaceutical profession and government," and indicated also in a summary fashion that some attempt is being made to co-ordinate the work of the three in terms of looking for a reduction in cost. I would hope that in time, and not necessarily in this particular section of the estimates, that the Minister will be able to give us a fuller picture of just how the government is attempting to co-ordinate this problem, because I know that just suggesting that doctors should use generic names is not really an answer unless the Federal Government sees to it that there is a proper way of enforcing an inspection of the manufacture of drugs so that equivalents are really equivalents and that generic names are not used to substitute inferior production. I'm aware of that, I know it's not a problem of this provincial government, yet the matter is so important in my mind, in the interests of the people of this province, that I feel that the department must make a special effort and a continuous effort to work at the problem of the high cost of drugs, which I think is not denied at all. I would think that in the light of what the Honourable Minister has already said about the savings that have been effected in those hospitals under the control of the department, that the information gleaned from the savings that had been made should be passed on to both the pharmaceutical association and the medical association in order to indicate and interest the doctors even more in an attempt to ascertain more information about the possibility of reduction of cost of drugs to the patients whom they serve.

I have confirmed in my recent discussions with doctors that they are too busy to fully investigate the question of costs, but I deplore the fact that they are so busy. I would like to think that they are given assistance by the department and by their own associations in attempting to provide the information which apparently is lacking, both to the medical and pharmaceutical associations.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Health, is there any change whatever in the grant formula, that is the contributions made by the Federal Government to the plan; has it changed at all since the plan was introduced in '57 or '58. Has there been any change in any respect in the formula?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . the last question, "any change in the grant". No, not in the basic formation of the grant. You mean 25 percent of the national average plus 25 percent of our cost, no; but from time to time we negotiate with the federal authorities re inclusion of other services if possible. The questions in reply to the Member for St. John's if you look on page 12 Sections b and c in the Annual Report, he will find the information concerning the consultant division to the plan, everything from a lab and x-ray architect, two physicians, nurse consultant, pharmacy, research, construction division with an administrator in charge and dietetics. We find that the staff we have at present is adequate to do the job they have to do. The average length of stay as indicated in this report which is tabled is something of course which varies for many reasons, everything from the geographical location of the facility concerned to the kind of patients they are treating -- and when in any particular breakdown such as new born stay and so on the consultants working with the hospitals concerned at the time of the budgets can review these several matters. I would point out that each hospital of course has its admission and discharge committee made up of the medical staff and of members of the practicing profession within each hospital who deserve a great deal of credit for their contribution to their individual hospitals, and through them and the general medical advisory committee of the medical profession to the commission.

There are no such things as private hospitals in Manitoba, except for company hospitals, mining companies such as the INCO Hospital and Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting and so on. To company hospitals -- and these have been the only private hospitals in the province -- we give an average per diem, that is if the hospital is 100 bed we only pay the company the average payment that we would pay, a similar facility of that size were it under the public hospital system. This has been the policy since the plan began operating and that is the answer to that question.

With respect to drugs the comments from the honourable member are well taken. They are exactly the sort of thing that has been concerning us and I can inform the Committee that both the Department of Welfare and Health have met with the Medical Profession, urged them to meet with the Pharmaceutical Profession in turn, and the MMA officially have expressed their concern as to the habits of prescribing which is something that is evolving and the Chairman of their Pharmacy Committee is also acting in an advisory capacity to ourselves; also through the Hospital Commission working with medical staffs and so on in the development of formularies where you can do this within the hospital confine. This is almost a partnership arrangement. As we all know there are certain aspects of the drug problem that cannot be controlled locally, but locally we should be able to make a real step forward in getting the co-operation of the people concerned from the prescriber to the dispenser of the medication. This is exactly what is under study with respect to our medicare program, the Department of Welfare are pursuing this matter where the profession have agreed to a restricted kind of formulary to operate under in an attempt to encourage their membership to follow suit in a very tangible way. I thought I should just answer these matters at this time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Plan has now been in operation nearly five years -- it will be five years, I believe, on July the 1st next -- and I don't doubt but that my honourable friend has from time to time appealed to the Federal Minister of Health for a broader type of grant formula. I don't doubt but that he has tried to do that. I know that Mr. Bend, the Minister of Health, back in 1957 and '58 made an appeal too, and I would just like to read one short paragraph here from what Mr. Bend said on April 5th, 1958, when the -- it's headed "The Final Debate" and here's what he says about Mr. Montieth. He says, "Now then the honourable member from Winnipeg South" -- I don't know who that was, Mr. Chairman, but maybe the same member -- "Now then the Honourable Member for Winnipeg South raised a very good question here when he said: "What about alternatives? Why should you just have one? Why couldn't a person come in and say, 'well, I want a deductible of so much. I like \$50.00 deductible, or \$25.00 deductible.' Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing we cannot do the way the Act is written at the present time in Ottawa, its uniform terms and conditions, and

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . that is religiously applied. Now I had a very fruitful discussion with the Honourable Minister of Health at the time" and Mr. Chairman, he's speaking about the Minister of Health in Ottawa -- "at the time, and who will no doubt be Minister of Health again, Mr. Montieth. I pointed out some of these things -- I don't remember mentioning this one in particular but the various things that I thought should receive a second look and he -- and he's referring to Mr. Montieth -- "and he gave an answer which I think has a certain amount of merit. He said, 'neither you nor I can tell how this is actually going to work. After we've had six month's experience we will be much wiser men. As far as I'm concerned, I propose to implement this legislation just as it is and then after the experience that the provinces and the Dominion Government have, if changes need to be made they can be made.'" Now apparently that's what Mr. Montieth told the former Minister of Health of this province back about the first of 1958. He indicated, Mr. Montieth the Federal Minister of Health that he would have a new look at it in six months -- that's what he says here. Now I suggest that at that time, if my memory serves me correctly, I think there were only six provinces entered into the agreement with Ottawa, and after five years of experience with 10 provinces, surely that after five years it is time to take a new look at the federal grant structure. The honourable federal minister here promised to have a new look at it. He said we would be much wiser men in six months and here it is five years and apparently there's been no change whatever in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, to quote my honourable friend, and this time I'm referring to the Minister of Health for this Province, quoting from the Information Bulletin of January 15th, 1962, there's a long list of services that my honourable friend believes that should be included in the Plan and he says, "There is no justification -- my honourable friend says -- there is no justification for excluding them." Now we were told on the hustings at the last three provincial elections that were held that one of the great advantages of having a Conservative Government in this province was by reason of the fact that there was a Conservative Government at Ottawa, and with a combination of that kind, that nothing was impossible. That is, they would be able to wield an influence with their federal counterparts and just about get anything that we wanted and that was desirable. And I'm surprised, completely surprised that my honourable friend hasn't been able to do more with the federal minister at Ottawa in consideration of what he said to Mr. Bend back about election time -- and I'm referring to the federal election of March 1958. And I agree with my honourable friend across the way that there is no justification; I agree with him on that, and I think that he should once again plead with the Federal Government at Ottawa for a changing of this formula. Because it is a fact that hospital cost services are not going to go down. If you study this tax foundation report, going right back to about 1945, you find that the per diem cost of care has gone up about a dollar a day every year. That is, every year you find the costs up about a dollar per day for the last 15 years, and likely they'll be up another dollar or two now. And there is one way we can curb the costs a little and that is by getting more money from Ottawa.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . to reply to this because in certain aspects I agree with the honourable member from Neepawa. From the day the Plan has come in to being I've had the most harmonious relationship with the National Minister of Health, who has been most considerate in the several ways in which he has helped us in the Province of Manitoba; most helpful in the area of extensions or bringing under the auspices of the Hospital Plan services such as sharing in cancer in-patient services; the introduction of physical medicine as an insured service in our Rehab Hospital, psychiatric services, all the way down to parking lots. We have had the most wonderful co-operation. However, I think both governments, past and present -- I have had no more luck to date with our Conservative confreres in Ottawa with respect to taking mental health under the wing of universal hospital care; anymore than he and his colleague when they were in office back in 1956 or '7. They excluded mental illness and both in and out of office all federal people talk of taking this under and, of course, we made a very strong pitch to this in the Royal Commission on Health.

With respect to fighting the cause for Manitoba for extensions of service, for better formula, for more requests for greater share of hospital costs, every year we go down to Ottawa and meet with the Advisory Committee to the National Minister from the various provinces and each year we go we talk about the several matters that he has mentioned. For example, the hospital construction costs of \$2,000 per bed, where we have -- all our recommendations in

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . this regard, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, are recorded in detail in the submission of this government to the Royal Commission on Health Services -- where we have suggested, and I have repeatedly requested a sharing by the federal authorities in the cost of amortization of our capital costs, which as you know the province bears entirely, other than for grants. But all this has been documented; all this has been discussed on a yearly basis at the national level and as the honourable member knows, within each province as long as the Hospital Plan is offered under uniform terms and conditions to all of the people in the province, the federal authorities will share.

MR. S. PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, disabled veterans under The Canada Pensions' Act receive free treatment in the federal institutions and still have to subscribe to the Manitoba Medical Services Plan. It seems to me that there is some duplication. I feel that they should be exempt at least to the extent of their disablement. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health can clarify.

MR. JOHNSON: Did the Member from Assiniboia say Manitoba Medical Service or did you mean Manitoba Hospital Services? -- (Interjection) -- Well that was a decision of the federal authorities. I can't give you all the details now but I think we've been through this two or three times in the past and the honourable member has, of course, missed that debate. I'm just a little rusty on it but there's the War Veterans' Pension who gets a pension as a matter of right from disability and there is the War Veterans' Allowance and while these men going into a Veterans Hospital get complete medical coverage, there is no means test, etc., applied to the war disability -- as a matter of disability a man receives a pension -- and because of that the Federal Government asks us to deduct a premium from him, the same as you would anyone else. For example, a war veteran with a disability might be in an income bracket of \$5,000 or \$10,000 a year for example and he would be expected to pay his premium through his employer or municipality. Then there's the war veterans' allowance group where veterans who are disabled or in real need and receive extra benefits. In these cases, the federal authorities I believe pay the premium of the disabled person, but expect him to purchase the premium to cover his family. This is a federal requirement under their statute under the agreement we have with them. So in effect, a recipient of war veteran's allowance has his premium paid for him, but he must cover his dependents. A war veteran who receives a pension because of disability regardless of -- unless he's in an income bracket where he qualifies under our regulations -- he has to pay a premium. At the present time 50,000 Manitobans, approximately, receive a waiver of hospital premium. You can actually have an income of \$960 a year or less -- you can have up to \$960 a year as a single person and about \$2,000 in the bank before you have to pay your hospital premium.

Now in the past, the federal authorities they never underlined this -- that is the veteran was given free hospitalization before universal hospitalization came in -- but now he is expected if he can to pay this premium. This has caused a lot of misunderstanding between our officials and the veterans' affairs people when the plan came into being but it's pretty well ironing out at the present time. I think we understand each other now.

MR. PATRICK: I agree with the Honourable Minister it seems that there is some misunderstanding just where to draw the line, but I do feel at least to all the single disabled veterans that they should be exempt, that the ones that haven't got families -- I think that this has been brought to the attention of some of the honourable members in Ottawa and they agreed with this, they couldn't see that this existed. I realize that they have to pay for their families, but I feel at least the ones that are single should be exempt.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . certain income bracket they do receive consideration I believe. I'm not sure of your question, but I'd be glad to look into the detail of it because I have a very large file on the whole subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . passed.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . some questions outstanding with the Minister from the other day under the discussion; I've been waiting until we proceeded with some of the other material that came up. Before I go into that, I feel that I should thank the Honourable Member for St. John's constituency for his very complimentary remarks about the Hospital Plan and as well the Minister of Health himself. The quotation has already been given in the House of course when my honourable friend was on the hustings and he called the Manitoba Hospitalization "the greatest

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . piece of social legislation since Confederation", and I suspected at that time my honourable friend was really trying to indicate that it had been, well somewhat as a result of his own political group. However, as everyone knows it was brought in by the previous administration, and I'm happy to receive the compliments on behalf of the previous administration for this fine work, Mr. Chairman. -- (Interjection) --

Now to get down to the questions that I had with the Minister the other day, and this goes back then to the hospital construction and the report that the Minister gave us tying in of course with what the Willard Commission had recommended. The Minister indicated to me the other night why it was that a number of these hospitals who were originally on the '62-'63 list had been pushed back to '63-'64. There are however some of them, which I listed the other night Mr. Chairman, which appeared on the last year's list, but do not appear on this year's list at all. I don't think that the Minister has answered that particular section. I'm referring to Beausejour which was in last year for '64-'65 and which I cannot find in this year's list. Gladstone in last year for '63-'64, I can't find in this year's list. Minnedosa similarly for '63-'64 and the De Salaberry Ste. Pierre similarly '63-'64. These I no longer find listed this year. Could the Minister indicate what has happened? Is this because these boards have changed their minds, do not wish to proceed? Or is it that the government has decided that these should not be proceeded with?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, this greatest change in social legislation, this great impact -- I forget what I said at that meeting but I was only saying that this is quite a step forward in social legislation which has opened a thousand doors to other areas of social reform which my honourable friend I don't think even appreciates yet -- with all respect to his ability.

With respect to Beausejour, commencement on schedule date is anticipated; I should have given more details to my honourable friend. Gladstone, preliminary planning is underway, as you know the grants are set aside . . . '63-'64. Ste. Pierre scheduling of the project depends on speed with which planning and other preliminaries are carried out by the hospitals. That was Ste. Pierre-De Salaberry.

I wondered if there were any further hospitals. Minnedosa -- The Honourable Leader of the Opposition will understand in giving the list I did, I was anticipating this year's projects. Minnedosa, building program is prepared by the Board, the planning should be completed for schedule construction start in early '64. If there are any further ones, I have a report here.

MR. TANCHAK (Emerson): . . . question on Emerson. I notice in here that "likely to start in '63 or '64". "Emerson 6 additional beds, interior renovations." They're anxious to know whether it will be started in '63 or '64. Naturally, they would like to have it started in '63. Have you got answer for that?

MR. JOHNSON: Commencement on schedule date is apparently anticipated as per schedule.

MR. TANCHAK: . . . Schedule 3 likely to start in '63 or '64.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. TANCHAK: In '63?

MR. JOHNSON: I think go ahead in '63 or '64 according to my report.

MR. TANCHAK: Bit it's not definite.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . '64.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions I'd like to direct to the Minister. First of all, there must have been a certain date when they take over from the Hospital Services Plan till the Hospital Commission took over. I'd like to know the effective date. Secondly, under the old plan G. L. Pickering was Commissioner of Hospitalization; under the new plan the same man is chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission. I would like to know whether there is any change in responsibilities or obligations or duties and so on? Secondly, if there is, should there not have been an audit made at that particular time? Also we notice from this sheet that we got on the comparative statement of revenue expenditure from the hospital commission that there is an increased cost of a million or more every year and I asked the other day what kind of checks were made in order to check these costs. I received a rather vague answer. I would like to know what checks the commissioner or the chairman of the hospital commission is taking in this regard.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . with respect to the member. Question 1, July 1st, '58. Question

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . 2, Chairman of the Commission. The Commissioner of Hospitalization became the chairman of the commission. The duties are much the same as they were as commissioner except that he chairs for other appointees at regular weekly meetings. He carries on as a full-time basis in the capacity as chairman. The Act specifies "he may be a civil servant" and in this case the chairman is a civil servant running the hospital commission. He's there on a daily basis. The commission are people who come in and have a meeting one day a week, and matters of policy are shared by the chairman of the commission with the commission. This is the essential changes before. Under the present Act the Executive Director of the Hospital Commission, Mr. Holland, carries out the detail in charge of the day to day operations of the Plan which now frees the Chairman of the Commission to devote full time to meeting with the various boards, ironing out the several problems.

One can well understand with the revolution in health services, with 100 hospitals in the Province of Manitoba, that if the Commission and chairman of the commission are to spend three days with each hospital there isn't much time for anything else. The vastness of this public service has necessitated this and I certainly feel that in the past year it has been a distinct advance in the favour of everyone in the Province of Manitoba. The duties as such I pointed out the other night are spelled out very clearly in the Act we passed last year. Certainly, the increase -- we pointed out last year that the initial stages of the hospital plan were jumped from \$27 to \$35 Million were largely due in the first year or two to the making up for the bulge in salaries; hospital salaries were brought more or less into line with private enterprise in the first few years and the big bulge was expected and received in those first two years of operation. However, as we go forward from now on, as we create facilities, as our population grows, we need more beds and we will have more costs, and this is something we'll have to realize. I would say that the only thing that will keep this hospital plan -- and I say this seriously -- the only thing that will keep this plan within reach of the people of the Province of Manitoba is the development of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals where we put all the emphasis on a diversification of activities, which we are trying to do. You can't overbuild in any one area without going short somewhere else, in the sense that if you build too many acute beds at the expense of not enough chronic beds you get an imbalance of hospital service. However, this is what's constantly before us, and really for the first time in the Province of Manitoba, under the standards division of this commission you have a team of specialists in the various fields sitting down with hospital boards discussing every item of the budget, the general trend; the research and statistic division to help with the budgetary requirements, the very strictest and the most detailed study by actuaries and chartered accountants of the plan, plus our consultants and so on, deal with these budgets in a most detailed way. If my honourable friend would like to go to the commission some day and just see some of the processing that goes on I think he would feel a lot better than what he has indicated here.

MR. FROESE: . . . . . Mr. Chairman, I don't think he answered the one question I had. The old hospital plan is no longer operative, it is defunct since the time that the commission took effect; but would it not be essential to have an audit made at that particular time; when you transfer the assets from one organization or from the Plan to the Commission?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe so. Every year the whole operation is audited by the Comptroller-General.

MR. MOLGAT: The report that was given to us last year by the Minister -- this schedule -- was according to the Willard Report recommendations, was it not? That's correct. So variations from this then presumably are decisions by the government to vary. I note, for example, that some of those that were listed last year as emergency projects for '62-'63 are really now in the '63-'64 category. Now I understand from the Minister that this is because of negotiations with the Boards. This is my understanding. My next point is, those that have been moved up, Mr. Chairman -- for example we were discussing the Grace - St. James Hospitals. If other Boards who are scheduled according to the Willard Report for a later date wish, and are ready to proceed before the date scheduled, I presume that they will be given the same privilege, the same opportunity as the others, such as the St. James one or as the Swan Lake one, which is listed now in '63-'64 and did not appear at all in the original statement by the Minister. This is the only assurance really that I want, that there'll be no hold up in those areas where a hospital board is prepared to move ahead and are ready to build, that they have the approval of

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . the ratepayers, that the government will not hold them up in view of the fact that exceptions have already been made in the Willard recommendations.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll explain again. I want to make it abundantly clear. The Willard Report was sort of a blueprint for the next few years to give us the guide lines as to what kind of facilities should be created and how and when and where, and by and large the government approved the Willard Report and we then asked our officials to interpret the Willard Report in terms of these categories of projects and what year they should go ahead on the basis that grant monies would be available at that time. We classified them into emergency, etcetera. For example, the Victoria Hospital went ahead right away and fixed up their roof as an emergency project -- renovation project. Also the Winkler Hospital was considered an emergency project, but by the time you get going with plans and so on, it takes two years to get the hospital up. In the meantime we call it an emergency. However, when you say to me there's a project say slated here for '64 or '65 and another hospital doesn't go ahead in the meantime, can you advance hospitals. We've told the Commission to exert flexibility and recommend to me and they'll keep the Minister in the picture. However, I can tell the Committee for example, the Victoria didn't go ahead on schedule, which means that beds weren't created when we expected them. The Commission have studied this matter and with respect to the over-all needs in the Greater Winnipeg area another hospital is going to go ahead and fill that need in the meantime, and going ahead with the project which has been, in general terms, recommended by the Commission, approved by the government. I think this is it. I think, in answer specifically to the honourable member's question, if a hospital wants to go ahead ahead of schedule, we try our best to respect the wishes of the board concerned if it fits in with the over-all picture of the need at the time.

MR. MOLGAT: In last year's report the Minister had some additions there, insofar as some Federal Government hospitals, but these may affect, of course our own position in Manitoba. I see -- and I am referring now to page six of last year's report -- the Whiteshell and the Fisher River I see in this year's report is going ahead. No, rather the Whiteshell and the Pine Falls. Churchill was simply listed as "under negotiation with the Federal Government" and I wonder what the negotiations have led up to; and then Fisher River, I see no indication of any further matters there and I wonder if the Minister could advise us what will happen in that case.

MR. JOHNSON: Both Fisher and Churchill will depend on the decisions at the federal level. We have notified federal authorities sometime ago that in creating a new facility at that site we were willing to play our proper role. The Whiteshell construction is anticipated this coming year, of course. Fisher River -- that was the new hospital -- depends on decisions of the federal authorities. We've heard no more with respect to that facility.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last year then we were in negotiation with them, but the federal government have not decided yet. Is this the situation? Fine. I wonder if the Minister could advise us, and I may have missed this in his remarks. I don't recall it. The situation with -- is it the Clearwater Hospital or Clearwater Bay which is a term used for the one at The Pas -- whether it's the intention to continue, or what are the plans for that institution?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, nothing in the immediate future. There are some tuberculosis patients there and 58 beds, I believe, approved under the Commission. We are in negotiation with the Sanatorium Board, and the Commission at this particular time. The long range feeling was and the recommendations of the Willard Report that in the development of any permanent facilities at that site, that consideration should be given to developing these in The Pas proper at St. Anthony's Hospital. However, the present facility will carry on for the present time and the Sanatorium Board authorities and the Hospital Commission are still studying this whole matter.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . will the decision insofar as the Clearwater Hospital have any effect on the decision with regard to the hospital in The Pas itself, with St. Anthony Hospital; and if it does then when will the decision be made so that the St. Anthony Hospital can make its own decisions as what to do?

MR. JOHNSON: I imagine a decision will be made in the next -- as the Sanatorium Board and the Commission develop a positive recommendation to the government, then we can consider just when this should go ahead in view of the situation with respect to the Clearwater Hospital.

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . . In the five-year study which was made, you will recall that there was no firm recommendation in the next shorter period to develop a chronic facility, or didn't indicate what should be done with the present Clearwater facility. However, this is a matter that we're looking into and generally we do adopt the over-all philosophical philosophy that chronic beds if at all possible should be developed in conjunction with acute hospitals.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this I think gives my answer insofar as the hospital end. It seemed to me that the Minister in giving the replies the other day to some matters from the day before, was to give me — when I asked him the question regarding the incidence of venereal disease in certain areas, he agreed with me that there was a very large majority from one locality and I asked him if he could give me what the percentage of the total cases came from this area and the Minister said "I can find out the percentage, yes." I wonder if he has that figure for me.

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't got the figure yet and I should qualify my remarks the other night, that this disease like others is no respecter of social status. However I do point out that I will try my best to get the percentage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7 passed; 8 passed; 9 passed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just a minute. On number 8, Mr. Chairman, under Health Units. A short while ago we were speaking of home care, hospital centred home care and there was a possibility of studying the community centred home care. Now it would seem to me from some information that I have that we might be able to use some of these public health nurses and doctors to do quite a bit of this work of home care and I think that would be well advised to mention this at this time and when the government decides if it should go ahead with either the hospital centred program or the community centred program, that we should look into the possibility of using the health unit nurse that we already have. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate at this time if this is -- not to say for sure that this will be done -- but does he feel that this is feasible, that it's practical, that it's advisable that these public health nurses and doctors could enter the field of home care. As I said it seems that they would be certainly qualified and it would work very well with them and these people are already paid by the province.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the nursing staff are most anxious to play their role in home care programs and we are developing this within our health units with our staff. The happy hospital based home care programs, community based programs with a variety of skills are required and we are most interested in this field and have, as the committee knows, programs under our departmental co-ordinator, Director of Rehabilitation Services, through our Social Allowances program by teams of welfare supervisors and health doctors working at the local level on local assessment panels, assisting the practicing physicians in the hospitals in placement of cases using the various resources in the community. We'll continue to pursue this and the Commission, as I indicated, is pursuing this from the standpoint of what effect this has on medical practice itself; what constitutes medical practice; what constitutes hospital based home care programs.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that many people in the health unit as well as in the hospitals would like to have some indication as to when the Government and the Commission will reach a policy on this. Is it asking too much to ask the Minister if he feels that this will be done within say the next few months or does he feel that this will be a question of years before this is done or is that an impossible question to answer?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I would just indicate to my honourable friend how many administrations -- for example how many home care administrative set ups should we have in Greater Winnipeg. For example, one home care program and staff based at the General should be sufficient for all the hospitals in that area -- this sort of thing. This is what we're looking at to prevent duplication and also the co-ordination. It's not enough for a hospital to have a home based program. Perhaps the provincial co-ordinator should be in on this where you can utilize the resources in the community, such as V. O. N. services and the Family Bureau, housekeeper services and this sort of thing. And this is what is being developed and we're getting excellent co-operation from all these voluntary associations as my honourable friend knows. There's certain aspects of this before we go ahead with hospital based programs that are of real concern to the Commission and I'm expecting a report within the next few months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9 passed; 10 passed; 11 passed; 12 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this is a very small item, but I wonder if the Minister -- I can find nothing in the report -- I wonder if the Minister can indicate how many people are involved here under 12 and what areas are served by this and where are they located?

MR. JOHNSON: Medical Officers in Unorganized Territory? Given me the wrong lead here. There are 14 people involved and it's increased slightly this year. Dr. H. . . . , a doctor in the north end of my constituency is doing some extra work north of Hecla Island. These people are located at Pine Falls, Beausejour, Winnipegosis, Ashern, Arborg, Teulon and there's some other chaps here, I don't know their location -- it gives the names of the physicians -- Riverton, Lynn Lake -- there are 14 doctors concerned. These are doctors in private practice in outlying areas who are going into certain areas where we have no regular health unit services and they render -- and in some cases there are health unit areas -- but they render us special services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12 passed; 13 - -

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, no, on 12. How are these set up? Are these at the request of the local areas, or are these a decision of the department as to need and what happens exactly? Are these people on call to people in the unorganized territory or are they going out on specific requests from the department? What is the program?

MR. JOHNSON: These are just for public health services, attending immunization clinics and carrying out immunization procedures in these areas. For example, the doctor at Arborg receives, with a large area there, say \$500 a year. This is an arrangement made between the physician and the department and we usually pay them \$30.00 for a half day. This is the method you go about it. For example, one physician is paid \$600 a year for 10 full days in the field with our public health nurses. Now what happens is that we'll decide that a certain area has to be immunized, or certain schools attended, the public health nurse will tee up the clinic and provide all the biologics and the physician supervises same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12 passed. 13 passed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, under 13, this might be the item where I can bring in the suggestion that I made during this year and last year -- The question of having a plane that could be used as an ambulance in an emergency. We saw an example of that in the past and that plane could also be used for either transportation of personnel -- I don't think that's too much of a problem now -- but especially for when speed is required where you can send the plasma, and so on. I wonder if the Minister has anything on this. I think this year also I suggested that maybe this could be done in co-operation with the Medical Association who has indicated, at least given some thought, are interested in maybe having an obstetric flying team. I wonder if the Minister has any suggestion on this or -- (Interjection) --

MR. JOHNSON: . . . No, go ahead! Go ahead!

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Perhaps the Minister would answer my questions, too, Mr. Chairman. I take it this is the place to talk about ambulance service. I'm very glad to hear my honourable friend from St. Boniface, because I think he's changed his mind since June 28th, 1959, when the Tribune carried a story about "Ambulance Services said Okay. Two undertakers, one Liberal and the other Conservative, joined forces to combat a CCF resolution in the Legislature Friday urging the creation of a government-owned land and air ambulance service." I'm very happy to hear my friend speak for some sort of ambulance service, because, Mr. Chairman, I quoted at that time an article written by no less an authority than Major-General Worthington, and he said that in the six years of World War II there were 55,300 casualties in the Canadian Army. He said that there also were 83,506 people killed or injured in motor accidents on Canadian highways and he said that if the Army looked after its casualties, or if it made as little provision for them as we civilians do for ours, there would be a hue and cry raised in Canada that could defeat a government. He's pointing out that in these days of fast travel that the story is different now. Modern armies have first class doctors and surgeons working in field hospitals close behind the lines, and trained ambulance men see that the wounded are taken there as soon as possible, even during the heat of battle. I'd like to quote further, Mr. Chairman, briefly -- I won't take the trouble to read this article, but he says that "medical science is of little help unless it can be applied in time, and wounded men can die of shock and exposure as readily on the highway as on the battlefield. Recognizing

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . this the Army has trained personnel to operate efficient ambulance service at the front and many Canadian veterans owe their lives to this fact." But then he asks us to take a look at the civilian record. "In 1958 highway accidents in Canada accounted for 3,134 deaths and 80,372 injured. Of those injured it is estimated that at least one out of 24 are totally disabled for life. It's impossible to say how many of those 3,134 would be alive today if adequate ambulance and medical care had been promptly available, but it's reasonable to assume that of the approximate 3,537 who were totally disabled many could have fully recovered. It is in this field of casualty clearance that we are failing dismally, for our ambulance service in Canada is appallingly inadequate." No less an authority, Mr. Chairman, than Major-General Worthington.

Here at home it's much the same and I think that the remarks by my honourable friend from St. Boniface perhaps was prompted by a Brief that was submitted by the Manitoba Medical Association to the Winnipeg Police Commission, and I quote from this article, Mr. Chairman, in which they're advising a central government-run service as the ideal solution. And I'm quoting: "The Medical Association in its brief said, convenience of patients or casualties is an aspect of public health and as such the responsibility for and cost of the service should be borne by a single provincial ambulance agency. A government agency was universally recommended in all reports studied." The brief broke down its recommendations into three categories: those for an ideal ambulance service; those for service covering Greater Winnipeg specifically; and those for rural Manitoba. The brief said: "provincial and metropolitan ambulance service now were inadequate, inefficient, uneconomical and subject to a constant cycle of change as each private service becomes bankrupt in turn and goes out of business." Well if I were predicting something unusual in 1959, it's very encouraging for me to read this, and as I said at that time it's nothing new because in the sister province to the left of us, they've had an ambulance service now for many years.

Perhaps I could read something that happened there. I'm talking about the type of aircraft that they have now. I think I mentioned before that this ambulance service is available to every resident in Saskatchewan on the call of a doctor, policeman or clergyman. The rates are reasonable and they have now acquired some new type of ambulances there. They can take off at 30 miles an hour and land; they're built for the job; they're not, as was envisioned here, a private enterprise could take care of our casualties in the north, and there's no doubt about that, Mr. Chairman, that people do respond to these emergencies but I submit that the type of aircraft is not suited for this job. This aircraft that they have in Saskatchewan has been built specifically for this job. Now that isn't the only thing. It's not long ago on December 9th, 1959, that an alderman in the City of Winnipeg lashed out at the "ambulance haggling". This alderman said that firms would query the callers about the ability to pay. When someone calls for an ambulance, even in answer to a 999 call, they still want to know where the money is coming from, because these are privately run ambulances. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it's time for this government to take a look at this. It is well that we are spending more money on health and education and in my service to the community as an Alderman I was always impressed by the amount of trouble we go to to build fire stations and this sort of thing; but if we can spend this money to protect property, why aren't we considering more the human life aspect of this. In this brief submitted by the Medical Association, they say that, and they're suggesting as I did then, that the ambulances be stationed in the firehalls. These men are on duty 24 hours a day -- isn't it just as important that severe hemorrhage be attended to as someone's chimney on fire? I'm asking this government to consider this.

I remember seeing on Main Street a few years where a street car had run over a little girl and it was forty minutes before emergency equipment became available to jack up this street car to remove this child, and I thought at the time that while everybody responded, from the police force to the fire department, no emergency service was available for this. I think that this is something we should look into -- it's emergency service. Severe hemorrhage on the highway today is common, because of the speed of the vehicles and because of the distances that are travelled and I think it's time that the government looked into this aspect of transporting people that are severely injured.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer the last speaker. He seems to have developed, or to have borrowed something from the members opposite us and using two

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . topics and mixing them together -- two different topics. I must say that I certainly am in favour of a plane and I don't think that that could be operated by private enterprise too well, it would be pretty difficult -- I don't know who would be too interested because of the cost. That is one thing and I've always been in favour of this. Now I recall that I was against the motion of the honourable member when this was brought up a few years ago because I felt that as long as private enterprise could take care of this ambulance problem -- and this has nothing to do with planes -- that this should be done as such. Now I might say that I would not hesitate to change my mind if I feel that this is not being done too well, and I did mention that last Friday when I said there's a limit -- I've always defended private enterprise and I said there's a limit how far you can go and if the rumours that I'd heard were true, that the people were starting to pick pockets -- these operators of ambulances were starting to pick pockets to get their pay when people were unconscious that I think there was time for a change. But apart from that I don't know if this is founded -- I'd like to know. I understand that they're doing very good work. They've had trouble at the time -- definitely, they have to be paid to operate.

I am also very pleased to see the honourable member that spoke so interested and thinking that Major Worthington is such a clever man, and I certainly share his feelings on that, and I would tell him that he is even much better when he brings recommendations on the field that he's really an expert on, on nuclear arms, and I would suggest that the gentleman and his party would read and have as much confidence in General Worthington as they had on this.

Now I think that this had to be set straight. There's two different things. I'm suggesting that the government is the only one that can go in the air ambulance at the time. I still think that private enterprise is very capable of taking care of the rest and if the time comes where it can't, I will not hesitate for a minute if I feel that this is not done well, if people are caused to suffer because of those people I will not hesitate for a minute to side with my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13 passed. 14 passed.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection) -- Can the Minister tell us how the \$92,000 expenditure in (14) is being handled? By who and under what jurisdiction?

MR. JOHNSON: This is being handled by our Director of Dental Health Services, who with six full-time dentists, two additional dentists in institutions and practitioners on the province, along with full-time dental assistants and dental hygienists on a regional basis carry out a preventative health dental program and have clinics at regular intervals throughout rural Manitoba especially.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 14 passed.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment or two in connection with this particular item. I think this is the only item on which I can say what I wish to say in respect of dental services in the Province of Manitoba. I would like if it's at all possible for the Honourable the Minister of Health to give to the Committee a breakdown as to how the dental clinic is operating in the City of Winnipeg -- and the dental clinic to which I make reference at this time is the one that was set up as a result of many debates in this House in previous years of the battle of denturists as against that of the dental profession. Now, I don't want to revive at this particular time all of the debate that took place -- I think some of this goes back to even before the Honourable Member for Gimli was the Minister of Health, that is the arguments between the denturists and the dental profession. Pardon?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . old as both of us.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes that's for sure. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that I don't want to bring up the full debate on this question at this particular time, but I will be interested to hear from the Honourable the Minister of Health, a report from him if possible as to how the dental clinic that was set up as the result of legislation is now operating in the City of Winnipeg. I also want Mr. Chairman, under this item, to raise a protest as to the apparent method which is being used at the present time, if the informants who have given me the material, if this is correct. I want to raise an objection to the manner in which the Dental Act of the Province of Manitoba is being enforced.

Now, I think first of all I should say that it's my understanding that the Legislature in its wisdom or otherwise gave to the dental profession the policing of a Dental Act and if I recall correctly in the debates that we had at that particular time that we were given the general

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . assurance that in the policing of the Dental Act, by the Dental Association of the Province of Manitoba, that there would be in general restraint used and that the policing would be on a highly ethical basis and manner. However, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a letter which I received in November of last year from a man who is a dental technician, a man who came to Canada some five or six years ago from Hungary and apparently had full qualifications insofar as his profession is concerned and set up practice here in the City of Winnipeg, or the City of St. James to be specific, at an invitation of a number of dentists here in this general area. And then on November 20th of last year, I received this communication from him and I want to place this on the record and I want to hear from the Minister of Health as to his reaction in this particular case. The letter -- and this is a copy of the letter, Mr. Chairman, not the original itself. The letter goes on to state: "Dear Mr. Paulley: I am a dental technician and due to the unethical conditions now existing of which you are probably unaware, I feel it is only fitting to inform you of the present situation. The Manitoba Dental Association have engaged detective inspectors whose treatment of technicians is unjust as though we are criminals. I strenuously object to the callous, discourteous methods used by the inspectors. They walk into the premises without a word of greeting, do not remove their hats and while one watches the door, the other in a gruff voice demands to see our prescriptions. Our doors are under constant surveillance and they keep count of the people entering and leaving. Spying and phone calls are also part of the routine. Needless to say working under such conditions is very difficult and unpleasant. One begins to wonder if the Gestapo have invaded our democratic way of life.

"The Manitoba Dental Association is a powerful force because under the present Dental Act and with their large money machine, they are able to force a member of our profession out of business and leave Manitoba. The hue and cry has been that there is a shortage of dentists to accommodate the needs of the dental health of the province, hence with the use of the above tactics qualified technicians are being eliminated and becoming scarce. Technicians have been brought into Court because he has served the public; nevertheless there must be a good reason why the public continues to demand our services. In other provinces where it is evident the technician is allowed to practice directly with the public in the needs of prosthetic work, all concerned seem content and satisfied. Now I ask you as a member leader of our Legislature, is this Canada? It seems like a trivial matter, but I say that it is a direct threat and violation of the freedom, our freedom as Canadians. In the face of common decency, let us have an end to all this deceit and hypocrisy with a sensible approach and solution which will benefit all those concerned. I thank you for your attention and would appreciate your interest on the above and for the confidence of my name." End of the letter, Mr. Chairman.

Now it appears to me, and I've had conversations with this individual, and while I appreciate the fact that when we were discussing the previous Bills here in the House as to whether or not the dental technicians should be given the privilege or not of dealing directly with the public -- and I realize quite fully that at that particular time, it was felt that many of the technicians, the dental technicians in the city and province were performing work that should have been in the orbit of being performed by a dentist himself and not by a dental technician -- and I appreciate the fact that as a result of legislation which we passed in this House, and I think there was some controversy over it, that in many cases it became necessary because of the fact that some dental technicians were going beyond their particular field in treating patients that it was necessary in the legislation to prevent this. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to this particular individual and I might say incidental to this I did see some of the qualifications insofar as his old homeland was concerned and they seemed to me to be rather high level in calibre, that the individual now has left the Province of Manitoba. But in this particular case, from the evidence that I have been able to garner, this person was invited to come into the Greater Winnipeg area to act as a dental technician by a group of dentists who said that they would provide him with the necessary work, and following this, following this -- and I might say incidental that I am informed that a considerable amount of dental work was performed by this party and that the payment of the bills by the dentists were rather slow in coming forth -- but of course that is beside the point. But the point is that here is an individual who was invited into the country to -- into Manitoba -- to perform the work and then as he tells me, and as I have indicated by this letter, in the policing of a Dental Act that unethical

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . methods were used by the profession in approaching him and his place of business.

Now then this raises to me, Mr. Chairman, a very vital question as to whether or not the Minister of Health or this Legislature should take a close look at the provisions in the Dental Act which gives to this profession -- and I appreciate the fact that we have to have some surveillance in many of our Acts -- but I raise the question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health, whether or not we should take a look at the Act which gives to any association, the right to police. And if the information that is given to me is correct . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.