

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 16th, 1964.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before 5:30 I was making the point that back in 1961 I had taken the stand that the matter of public aid to parochial schools was one in which I felt, at least, that the people who held the conviction that they wanted their children to attend a parochial school, they should have this conviction honoured, not only by way of allowing them to send their children to a parochial school at their own expense but also to the extent -- they should be honoured to the extent that they would be allowed to, either directly or indirectly, have some portion of their taxes directed toward the support of parochial schools. I took that stand on the belief, or on the conviction, that where fundamental civil rights or minority rights are concerned, we should be prepared to extend and to aid the exercise of this right to the fullest extent possible, and that we should not simply aid and allow the exercise of such rights that might be found to be popular or convenient, because to take such a position is to make a mockery of the importance of the exercise of civil rights.

I belong to a party that has the philosophy of social democracy, and that philosophy tries to hark closely to the philosophy that the public good must come first and therefore if laws and ministerial regulations are necessary for the carrying out of programs in the public interest this must be done, and if this meant that some individual rights were infringed upon we could take no other stand but that rights should be honoured to the fullest extent possible, bearing in mind the over-riding importance of the common good and the public interest, and I take this precise same stand here, that unless you can prove that the common good or the public interest demands that no aid be extended to parochial schools -- unless you can prove so by means of a valid and comprehensive study and supporting data, then you have no right to deny the exercise of certain rights to individuals or members of a minority group or groups. And I am still not convinced that in large urban areas in this province that we could not extend a measure of public aid to parochial schools. I'm not convinced that we couldn't do this while still protecting and safeguarding our public school system from any kind of encroachment. In rural areas, I think I should make it clear, my belief is that in rural areas to aid and abet the establishment or construction of parochial schools would detract from the optimum enrollment population of our country schools. I believe that there is such a thing as an optimum enrollment per school district or per school building, and to do anything that would detract from this optimum enrollment would, in my opinion, be undermining the public interest or the common good. So therefore I could not be prepared to support aid to parochial schools in such areas, but I insist, and it's worth repetition, that in urban areas we would in no way be detracting from the optimum enrollment of our many large schools in the City of Winnipeg and the suburbs. Then it becomes a question of adding a little perhaps to the tax structure but that is not the same. That is not the same as detracting from the optimum enrollment of a school, because to do that is to really make it impossible for that school to operate at the maximum level of efficiency, and so this is how I justify my attempt to get the government to incorporate into its resolution the provision that this committee shall study, not only the feasibility of shared services program, but at the same time and while they're at it, to study the possibility and the probability of having a measure of aid to parochial schools in urban centres and to study to see if this is not possible without detracting from the optimum enrollment of our schools as they now exist.

I think that we must do this in fairness to the minority groups. I think, moreover, we must do this in fairness to ourselves because I get the distinct impression that we are refusing to acknowledge reality here. We are pretending that to deny aid to parochial schools-- we're pretending that this does in no way encroach upon the fullest possible exercise of fundamental civil right. And we are also hard put to justify our practice and our stand when we relate this to the practice in other provinces, and so we go to all lengths subconsciously and within ourselves to try to justify what we are now doing.

I think it's evident that we do that when we look at the resolution's sponsor, because

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... the first three points made in the resolution are to me very much open to criticism. May I say, Madam Speaker, that it is one thing to bring in a resolution; obviously what's involved in one's resolutions is a matter of political judgment. Certainly this government and the First Minister are entitled to their political judgment. We can only argue and debate the efficacy of that judgment. But it is another thing, Madam Speaker, to postulate three principles which are academically inaccurate, or at least questionably accurate, because I want to make the point that when we talk of "the separation of Church and State as that expression is understood in Manitoba," we are really making a statement that has very little academic accuracy to it. What do we mean by the separation of church and state in Manitoba? Is there such a thing as the separation of church and state in Canada, and moreover, what -- if we're going to explain what we have in mind in this resolution, please start by explaining what is meant by the separation of church and state because, in the first place, that statement is a 19th century concept which really is, if I may use the expression, a shibboleth. It's a convenient platitude and not much more, and even if you do embrace the concept of separation of church and state in the 19th century concept, how do you relate this to what we are asking for here when we ask for a measure of aid to parochial schools, because when we speak of separation of church and state we usually mean, I presume, that the state shall not single out one denomination and favour it to the exclusion of all others. That is what is usually meant by the separation of church and state. There will be no singling out and granting of special position to one particular denomination, but to grant a measure of public aid to parochial schools is not to single out one denomination and to grant it a special position and this simply should not be ignored. It would be different if the government were asked to grant a measure of public aid to the schools of one particular denomination and to reject the requests for similar treatment by those of all other denominations. Who's asking for this? No one. So therefore, to speak of the granting of aid to parochial schools -- to speak of it as though it means the establishment of a church, is to me perfectly ridiculous. It just simply doesn't make any sense.

And if we were to take this concept as expressed in the resolution to its logical conclusion we would end up being forced to stop the making of grants to hospitals that are run by church groups; we would be forced to stop saying prayers here in this Assembly at 2:30; in fact, let me quote from the opinion of one of the justices of the American Supreme Court, in which country, by the way, the separation of church and state is more explicitly dealt with than it is in our country, and despite that explicit provision in the American Constitution this is what one of the judges of the Supreme Court had to say, and I'll just read a couple of sentences. He says, and I quote: "The first amendment" and that's the one that deals with the separation of church and state clause, "The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency of one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be alien to each other, hostile, suspicious and even unfriendly. Churches would not be required to pay property tax; municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups; policemen who help parishioners into their places of worship would violate the constitution; prayers in our legislative halls, appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the President, the proclamation making Thanksgiving Day a holiday, the oath 'So help me God' in our courtrooms, these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals and so on, would be flouting the first amendment. A fastidious atheist could even object to the supplication with which the court opens each session, namely, 'God save the United States and this court.'" This is quoted from the majority opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas of the American Supreme Court.

So I just want to point out that when we talk about the separation of church and state, let's not use it as a platitude. If we're going to use it at all let's define what we understand to mean by the term, and I for one insist that to grant aid to all denominations is not tantamount to disregarding separation of church and state; it's not tantamount to establishing a religion; and therefore for whatever argument you're going to use to refuse to grant aid to parochial schools don't use this one, because it doesn't make much sense.

And then further, actually in the preamble of the resolution, it says, "Whereas in Manitoba, constitutional provisions, juridical decisions and political determinations prescribe three

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)...general principles," which follow, one of which I've dealt with. Those three phrases there, "constitutional provisions, juridical decisions," those two out of the three should be deleted, because the academic fact of the matter is that it's political determination that has prescribed these three principles, not constitutional certainly not juridical decisions because, anyone who wants to hark back to the period of the 1890's will know that the judicial committee of the Privy Council in handing down it's decision in this matter said to this effect, that while the legislation of 1890 did not prejudicially affect the rights held by Catholics prior to union -- it admitted this -- nevertheless it did prejudicially affect the rights held by Catholics, Anglicans, and other minorities, rights which they held after the union, and so the judicial committee held or was of the opinion that minority rights had been flouted and that there was legitimate cause for appealing to the federal government to take remedial action. So how can you say that juridical decisions have indicated that there shall be no granting of the measure of aid to parochial schools? On the contrary, juridical decisions, the most important one, held that rights gained by these minorities after the union had in fact been prejudicially affected. So much for juridical decisions.

What about constitutional provisions? If members will consult the last volume of our revised Statutes of Manitoba they will find there the Manitoba Act, section 22, sub-clause 2, and what is the effect of section 227. It states there, it was put there in the first place to give a safeguard or a protection to minorities insofar as their rights in education were concerned. The provision of that statute, well that statute still stands. We have simply been disregarding it since 1890. Furthermore, section 93 of the British North America Act, which is an imperial statute, sub-clause 3 of section 93 contains the very same provision as section 22 of the Manitoba Act, namely, that rights held by minorities with respect to education shall be safeguarded and if they are infringed upon the minority shall have access to appeal to the federal government. These are the constitutional provisions, Madam Speaker, and to say otherwise, to imply that constitutional provisions seem to dictate that there shall be no granting of aid to parochial schools to me is simply stating the converse of what was actually intended in the first place.

I have taken this stand since 1961 ever since I really addressed myself to this problem with any amount of concentration. I shouldn't perhaps say this but, to be candid about it, I have had some inner struggle to come to this decision because for one thing I do not, and I might as well say so, I do not feel as strongly about this as the Member for St. Boniface. That is why he has been carrying the fight, and there can be no question about that. I come from a background that has never felt too strongly about the exercise of this right to exercise prior parental rights in education to the point of attending parochial schools and so on. In addition to that I have felt from time to time that the church of which I am a member has in its own schools turned out young people who, although of excellent moral quality -- I'm giving credit here to parochial schools -- excellent in that respect, nevertheless I have always felt that insofar as their social outlook is concerned -- well put it this way, I've never found enough progressive thinkers coming out of parochial schools, and I might as well be frank about it, it's just a matter of values and certainly even though I feel opposed to parochial schools on this ground, it's only a minor objection, because certainly those who believe in tradition and the respect for the status quo, obviously we have to have those in our society too, but I've felt at times that the products of these schools have been too much imbued with the worthwhileness of the status quo. They have not been progressive enough. In that way I find myself out of keeping, or out of sympathy with products, or graduates of parochial schools. But despite that, Madam Speaker, one does not have the right, such as myself, to oppose something because it does not happen to coincide with my own feeling of the matter. One must come to a conclusion on the basis of what is in itself the right thing to do. And I conclude that there is a very real right here that exists. The possession of that right can never be taken away from these people. They should be allowed to exercise it to the fullest extent possible. The only block, or obstacle, or provision that we should insert that would detract anything from that exercising of their right is the common interest in the public good. And so, unless it can be proven to me that to grant any aid at all would be to detract from the effective operation of our public school system, I have no alternative but, not only to vote but to fight for the extension of some aid to parochial schools.

I think that we in Manitoba should adopt some of the attitude that has been adopted by public

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)...figures in the Maritimes -- in other provinces too, but particularly in the Maritimes ever since Confederation. They have their problem there as between inter-denominational relations but they have always been able to work out acceptable arrangements. On what basis, do you ask? On this basis, and I quote: I quote the Honourable Mr. Fielding, a Protestant who was also Premier of Nova Scotia for many years, and this is what he had to say on the matter: "We have no separate schools as such by law in Nova Scotia. But I say that we could not have brought about that happy condition which they have if we had not been disposed to meet our Roman Catholic brethren" -- and I suppose you could insert the word Anglican, and others -- "in a generous spirit." Unquote, the former Premier of Nova Scotia.

And further, to quote an even more illustrious historical figure in Canadian history, the Honourable Joseph Hall, who had this to say: "We may make education a battleground where the laurels we reap may be wet with the tears of our country, but without mutual forbearance and a spirit of compromise we can do little good and make no satisfactory and permanent settlement of this question."

The net effect, Madam Speaker, is that here in Manitoba I am convinced that there will be no satisfactory solution -- at least one that will at best be satisfactory to only one side, if I can use that term -- unless such time comes when we are prepared to exercise magnanimity, and I'll repeat the word, magnanimity. This is some quality which we must have if we're going to attempt to reach a conclusion or solution that's at all worthwhile. And so far, I'm sad to say, there has been no attempt on the part of men in high places to foster this kind of feeling in this province.

And while what I have said tonight might be unpopular on both sides, at the moment I'm convinced that if not now, at least in ten years, and certainly within a generation there will be a greater amount of magnanimity shown and that eventually we will reach a settlement that will be acceptable to both sides. It won't be possible until there is magnanimity, and I think the sooner we learn the meaning of that word, with all its connotations, then we'll simply be bickering and continue to bicker.

Now the effect of this resolution is an attempt to move out of stalemate, but I am not sure that we are going to accomplish that since it is really couched in such terms as to put only one side of the matter into an area of investigation. While we're at it, and I repeat, Madam Speaker, while we're about to set up a committee to investigate the feasibility of shared services, why not at the same time investigate the feasibility of granting a measure of aid to parochial schools in -- well all over the province for that matter, but particularly in urban areas where it seems to be more feasible than in the country. And I would hope that someone will find this proposal of mine meritorious enough to want to incorporate it into the resolution by way of amendment. Unless we do that, I have to conclude that we are simply avoiding the nub of the issue, and that would be cause for sadness on the part of those who hold themselves as the champions of civil rights, minority rights in this province.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I find it very distasteful to have to disagree with my colleague from Brokenhead, but after all, this is a matter of conscience and not one of party. I want to say at the beginning that I agree with the three principles as outlined in the First Minister's resolution -- it has to do with the separation of church and state as that expression is understood in Manitoba; 2. The dedication of public funds to the support of a single public school system open to all children; and 3. The freedom to maintain private schools supported by private funds. I see nothing wrong with this and I must say that I think that the presentation of this resolution at this time is an earnest attempt to try to bring some order out of chaos on this important subject.

I probably will not make as academic a presentation as my learned friend, my colleague here, but I hope it will be nonetheless sincere. First of all I want to challenge him, or anyone else, on this question of minority rights. I find it very hard to agree with the fact that there is such a thing as minority rights in a democracy. I was brought up on the understanding that the majority have to rule -- just as in this House when we disagree severely, we simply have to smile at the finish and go along with the majority opinion. Now I think that this howling of minority rights is wrong. I believe that so long as we have individual right, so long as the individual has the right to worship as he pleases, and do the things that he's guaranteed by the Constitution of our country, he hasn't too much complaint. So I want to disagree right at the

(Mr. Wright, cont'd)...beginning on this question of minority rights. I think if we're going to allow every little group in our country to keep crying about their minority rights, we're going to be in trouble. It's the individual rights of a person, and they certainly have individual rights. They have the right to establish their own church and their own schools. I want to say, as I understand it, the onus for change is on those people who want it, and these people who want this aid will have to prove to me that they will not harm the thing that I'm for -- and I might say, Madam Speaker, I was invited in 1961, and when the pressure was on the MLAs to stand up and be counted, I did just that. And I gave it a lot of thought just as my colleague did on my left. I attended a meeting in North Winnipeg with, I imagine, 300 people -- I take it I would be probably the only Protestant there -- and I might say that I received a wonderful reception that night, and I had to tell those people that I was absolutely against them. This was hard to do. But at the beginning I told them I wasn't really against them, but I was for something, because after all I have no prejudices when it comes to this sort of thing, but I am "for" something, and I am for the public school system so strongly that unless anyone can show me where they will not undermine it, then I will have to respectfully disagree with them. This is the point, and I would suggest, the onus is on them to show us that they will not hurt the public school system. I don't see why we have to prove that they can have these things. Now it's not going to take me 40 minutes to state my case, because I'm stating it purely on a matter of principle, and I can never agree to the use of public funds to further a private belief, and it is my belief that if we do use public funds to the different private and parochial schools, and goodness knows, the recommendation as brought forward by the Commission in 1960 was that it didn't mention the simple matter of Protestant and Catholic. We have many many private organizations who would probably want a school here. And I can see, and until someone -- I must say that I have an open mind on the matter -- if someone can convince me that this can be done without undermining the thing that I am for, then I guess it must be interpreted that I will never agree to the use of public funds to further a private belief.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I think that one of the words that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead used, the word 'magnanimity', is very important, but I think that before we can get that, we've got to put all our cards on the table, and we've got to deal with this problem with all the aces showing, so to speak. And there's no point in us trying to debate these matters in the House unless we have done that and unless we are prepared to say in the House those things that we are prepared to say privately outside the House. So I say one of the first things we have to have before we get magnanimity, is to get all these statements out in the open where we can examine them and then get down to discussing them.

One of the first things, Madam Speaker, that I think we have to examine, is what do -- and I use the word Roman Catholic not from its religious connotation but because of the fact that this is the group that seem to be most interested in receiving aid for their parochial and private schools -- and I think that the first thing that we have to look at, as I said, is what do these people actually want for their children from our educational system? And I say these things not critically, but only as a statement of fact as I know them from sources which I will list. First of all, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface in his statements in this House has told us some of their aspirations. I have been told by Roman Catholic parents in private conversation some of these aspirations, and I have been told at meetings held in my constituency with Roman Catholics at which members of the clergy attended. These meetings were called by them, with myself, to discuss the school problems. We also can determine some of these aspirations from briefs submitted to and dealt with, not only by our own Royal Commission on Education but on the Royal Commissions that have functioned in the provinces of Alberta, B. C. and Ontario within the past five years. And I have studied these reports.

From these sources, Madam Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that what at least the Roman Catholic advocates of public schools want is complete segregation on a religious basis for all of their children, from the time that they enter school, be it kindergarten or Grade I, to the time that they leave high school. They want, I have gathered, their own Catholic university, their own Catholic teachers for Catholic children, their own Catholic teachers' college, their own text-books written for and approved for the use of their schools and their own curriculum, and direct representation to watch over their interests in the Departments of Education. And from what I can gather, Madam Speaker, they want all these things -- and I

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)...don't criticize their wanting them -- but they want them all supported by public funds. And I think, Madam Speaker, that we should have a look at the report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta and in particular Chapter 30 in which they dealt with their recommendation and the briefs which they had received relative to separate schools in that province. On page 268 of Chapter 30 of that report, it says this: "At the level of provincial organization, another criticism closely related to the foregoing was raised, namely that subtle and perhaps unconstitutional changes had taken place in the competition of governmental policy-making bodies, and that as a result the Catholic population is no longer directly represented as in past years within the Department of Education. The implication is that such Catholic members as may be in the Legislature provide inadequate representation for purposes of Catholic education. A further implication is that representatives acceptable to the Catholic Church should sit on a specifically constituted committee or in the departmental offices to safeguard the interests of the separate school system." This, Madam Speaker, is in a province where they have a separate school system.

With respect to teacher training the Royal Commission says this: "Specific statements were offered to the effect that an important element of the education of teachers for the Catholic separate school system involved the preparation to interlock the whole educative effort with the teachings of the church. It was not made clear to the Commission whether the desirable preparation was mainly philosophical or theological in nature, but philosophy courses now offered by the Department of Philosophy and Psychology of the Faculty of Education were deemed quite inadequate. Special courses presumably in religion and religious education or preferably separate Catholic teacher training institutions were suggested." On page 269 under the heading Curriculum: "The contention that teachers need to be trained differently for the separate school system was supported by another claim that not all content apparently suited to the public schools is acceptable to the separate schools. Presumably content should be screened and selected to exclude anything which might stimulate pupils to think along lines inconsistent with Catholic theology. Several examples of offensive materials were pointed out. Logically then, specific course content would be chosen to further Catholic aims of education, with texts specially prepared as instruments to accomplish these aims. Present curriculum and texts are found wanting in the above terms."

And on page 270: "By intent, the Department of Education has exercised its function in such a manner as not to discriminate between separate and public schools. Throughout hearings, however, it appeared on several occasions that separate school supporters felt their rights had been transgressed, but not to the degree, apparently, that required a resort to the courts. Whatever violation may have occurred cannot be established otherwise. Therefore, the Commission could study separate school problems only in the light of what their rights and privileges are thought to be as evidenced from present provincial practice." And still on page 270: "Since the regroupings of districts might not perpetuate the minority, it is requested that persons of the same religion as those wishing to operate separate schools should all be permitted to assign their taxes in support of the separate school system, whether in minority or not. Under such circumstances children whose parents are of Catholic faith could achieve their education under ideal conditions in better schools and segregated from all others of different religion. To complete the organizational reformation, curriculum and texts should be scrutinized by religious authorities for their acceptability, teachers should be separately trained and the religious minority should have special representation in government offices. Separate school champions aspire to a completely dual public school system."

"The indiscriminate establishment," -- this is on page 271 -- "of some separate school districts in Alberta, may be taken as a tangible indication of the priorities of religious over secular tasks of education, particularly in rural areas of small school population and limited resources. The formation of separate schools has resulted in such fragmentation of the public school system as to produce inevitably substandard educational opportunities." And I submit, Madam Speaker, that in connection with the last line of that paragraph, that this happened in some of the districts of Manitoba.

We are told by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, Madam Speaker, that we should implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission that reported to this Legislature some two years ago and that they would be satisfied with this. We are asked by people that advocate

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)...aid for parochial schools to do what other provinces do, and they would be satisfied. Well, Madam Speaker, it's another case of "distant fields appear to be greener." In Ontario, for example -- and this province is constantly referred to as one which we should look up to in connection with this matter of aid to parochial schools -- we find if we really dig into the situation that all is not as well in Ontario as we are led to believe. For over 100 years, Madam Speaker, Ontario has had a separate school system, largely Roman Catholic and financed by public funds. Listen to what the Ontario Royal Commission of 1950 had to say about this, and I quote from Chapter 29, page 492, and I want you to remember, Madam Speaker, that this is after 100 years of state aid or public aid to parochial schools, and after 100 years of this, this is what the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario said: "No phase of our inquiry has consumed more time or proved more difficult than that of Roman Catholic separate schools. Here we encountered a conflict of principles which still makes the problem as impossible of solution by agreement as it has been for the past 100 years. A minority of the Commission, who are submitting a separate report on the question of Roman Catholic separate schools, subscribe to the principle that religion must permeate all education and that to achieve this goal in the education of Roman Catholic children, the schools attended by them must be integrally Roman Catholic. While not departing from the brief that in a Christian nation religion should inspire education in the schools, the majority of the Commission are of the opinion that the school is but one of the three great educative institutions, the home and the Church being the others, and that a publicly supported system should avoid the special doctrines and dogmas of any particular church, but should be governed by those fundamental principles of Christianity which are held in common by all men of good will. It should be frankly stated that all members of the Commission entered upon their task with the hope that some satisfactory solution to the difficult problem of Roman Catholic separate schools should be quickly found. The alternative proposals which now form the basis of separate memoranda and a minority report were advanced to the Commission as a whole, and their practicability given full consideration. Long, earnest, frank and friendly discussion ensued but did not end in conclusive formula or unanimity. The majority of the members felt that the minority proposals contemplated an unacceptable extension of the jurisdiction of separate schools and were, insofar as they related to administration, impractical."

And on page 493: "If there is no finality then what was meant by those proponents and opponents of Roman Catholic separate schools when they used the term 'finality' nearly a century ago? In this last respect a point must be remembered, which the general public all too frequently overlook. No right or privilege in our school system was granted at any time, or preserved influentially or otherwise, to the Roman Catholic Church or any church as a religious body, organization or denomination. The rights and privileges which exist by law were granted to individual Roman Catholic and Protestant ratepayers. The basic right or privilege given to such a ratepayer was to elect to separate his support from the common or public school system, and in conjunction with others who were like-minded to establish a separate school." And on page 494, item 10: "For many years the existence and growth of Roman Catholic separate schools have been subjects of acrimonious debate. As recently as 1934 a prominent Canadian educator wrote, "For nearly a century, separate school and sectarian issues have operated as a divisive influence in our national life! The briefs and memoranda submitted to us bear witness to conflicting opinions still firmly held on those subjects." Madam Speaker, I suggest that perhaps these words could be even written today, or about the situation as it exists today in the province of Manitoba, that these words were written about a situation that has existed in Ontario for a hundred years, a province where they have a separate school system and where that separate school system is financed by public funds.

Now, I rather liked the presentation of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead. I think that he approached this from a calm and dispassionate -- although I don't agree with what he said I certainly agree with the way in which he said it, and Madam Speaker, if we were to solve this problem in the manner of speaking that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, in the way he spoke, I think that we would perhaps have much less difficulty than I can foresee, but what we are faced with in Manitoba is not this particular attitude towards this question. Mr. Arthur Mauro of Winnipeg, in a recent editorial in the Catholic Weekly Paper, has been named the chairman, and I notice in tonight's paper has been elected the President of a committee

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)...called the Committee to Establish an Association for Equality in Education. A clarion call has gone out, Madam Speaker, in a far different vein than that which the Honourable Member from Brokenhead relayed to us tonight, for Catholics of French, Anglo-Saxon, Ukrainian and other ethnic origins to unite. Anybody that doesn't believe this should read the editorial in the Sunday Herald of March 8, 1964. I have no intention of reading it all but I think that the last three paragraphs are important: "Not only should the new association be guided by leaders chosen impartially, no matter what ethnic origin or language, they must never allow themselves to be swayed by their political allegiance which has been in the past the most serious factor of disunity among the Catholics of this province, nor should professional standing, financial interest or social rank interfere in the least way to unite for a cause which demands, above all, the sacrifice of personal ambition, a deep understanding of brotherhood in Christ, and strong religious conviction. They must speak out as Catholics although their political party ties would enforce them to remain silent. They must stand up and be counted, even if this calls for the ruin of their political, financial or social career. The next few months will show to the world who are the true Catholic leaders in Manitoba."

Madam Speaker, I wonder if this is the declaration of war which was referred to in one of the speeches by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, and in my opinion, if this isn't advance notice that the next provincial election is going to be fought on the basis of whether you are a Catholic or a Protestant, I don't know what is; and Madam Speaker, it's most unfortunate and regrettable that this is the attitude that some people who advocate aid to parochial schools are taking. We who believe in a strong public school system must also unite to see to it that the activities of this group and any other group does not result in a campaign which, if successful, could seriously impair the working of our school system in Manitoba. Madam Speaker, this is something that we must all be guarding against in the months ahead while this committee is sitting.

Now with respect to the shared services, Madam Speaker, I mentioned in an earlier debate on this subject that I had some reservations and, Madam Speaker, I don't believe in beating around the bush. I said before I started these remarks that I thought that one way of solving our problem was to get them all on the table, and I intend to put these reservations that I have about shared services on the record now so that there will be no doubt about where I stand on this matter. I would like to repeat two statements that I made earlier in this House. One was that by conscience I believe it to be wrong to segregate children on the basis of religion. I believe that it is wrong for we members of this House to stand up and say that it is wrong to segregate in some northern school districts of our province Indians from white children, and at the same time to advocate the segregation of these same children on the basis of religion. I believe that it is wrong for us as individuals to be ashamed of the segregation of whites and negroes that takes place in the southern states of the nation to the south of us, and yet to defend or to advocate the segregation of children in our own country on the basis of religion. This is what my conscience tells me about this matter, Madam Speaker, and I am against public funds being used for aid, directly or indirectly, to support private or parochial schools. I believe in a strong public school system to prepare students for life, to prepare them to make a living in a complicated, technical and scientific society, and I believe in strong churches and in good Christian homes to prepare our children after school hours for the life hereafter and for the moral side of life, so I must approach this problem, Madam Speaker, from these two matters of conscience.

I am prepared to vote for this resolution, to give the plan that was announced by the Premier a chance to go before this committee and to be considered, but I reserve my right, Madam Speaker, after the committee has reported, to carefully examine its recommendations and, if I see in them public aid directly or indirectly to private schools, to vote against any legislation that adopts these recommendations.

There may be many ways in which shared services could be a wedge in the door or a first step towards public aid to private or parochial schools. There is no doubt that shared services is going to make available to private schools, or the parents of children attending private schools, a saving in the way of monies that they are not going to have to use if shared services comes into effect, on more teachers, on gymnasiums, auditoriums, chemistry labs, physics labs, shops facilities and facilities for teaching home economics, all of which they are going to have to do

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)... in the next few years if their children are, on graduation, going to be able to compete with children from the public school system, so if shared services then makes it unnecessary for the advocates of private schools to spend funds on these facilities, these savings could be passed on to the parents of private school children, or they could be used to further expand the system of private schools, and this could result -- and I can see this resulting, Madam Speaker -- in more and more children being withdrawn from the public school to the detriment of that system and further complicating our problem. This is only one interpretation that could be taken from shared services and which, in fact, has been taken from shared time programs that are operating in the United States. There are many others, but I agree, Madam Speaker, that the time to debate those is after the committee has reported and we see in detail what shared services means in terms of their recommendations and what legislation might be necessary in order to accomplish this, and in particular we want to know what regulations this committee is going to recommend in order to prevent shared services from being harmful in any way to the public school system.

I have one other fear, Madam Speaker, and this is a real fear. What happens if shared services doesn't work? Can we withdraw shared services if it doesn't work? Or in the event that it doesn't work is the answer to give private schools financial aid in order to be able to render these services themselves?

Not often, Madam Speaker, have governments been known to withdraw benefits but rather to extend them in order to make them more acceptable or more workable, and I want to be sure, Madam Speaker, that if this committee recommends shared services to us, that there will be strong built-in controls to ensure that this doesn't happen. Once shared services becomes official the government will have no control over its workability. Those who advocate aid to parochial schools, or I should say those who are operating parochial schools and our school division trustees are the people that are going to have to work together to make this system work, and if they can't do it and we get shared services back in our laps I want to know in advance what we do then. With respect to my desire and that of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface wishing to have members of this House stand and be counted on the main issue of public aid to parochial schools, no amendment to this resolution is necessary. No advocate of public aid to private schools could in conscience, and in my opinion, stand up and vote for the -- at least three of the things that are stated in this resolution. The first item: the separation of church and state, as that expression is understood in Manitoba; the dedication of public funds to the support of a single public school system open to all children; and further on in the resolution: and that in its consideration of the aforesaid the Committee shall adhere to the principles set out in the first preamble thereof. I can vote for this resolution, Madam Speaker, with the full knowledge that in words at least the three portions of the resolution which I have read is a stand by this government and this Legislature, if the resolution passes, against approval of public aid to parochial schools. If, however, the committee's recommendation as to how shared services will work brings this into conflict with any of these principles, then, Madam Speaker, I shall not accept shared services.

The resolution that we have before us, Madam Speaker, deals with shared services, and shared services or no shared services we might as well face the fact that we are really dealing with public aid to parochial schools. Shared services, whether we want it to be or not, is going to be judged in the light of whether it is or is not aid to parochial schools, and I think the Honourable Member from Brokenhead mentioned this in his address. Those against public aid to parochial schools are going to look on shared services with a great deal of suspicion. Those for aid to private and parochial schools have already declared themselves against it in the most, I would say, certain language. Those that shared services has been brought in to help are now fighting against it, despite the fact that this government has said by this resolution, "No public aid to parochial schools except shared services." And if that resolution passes, this Legislature has said in effect, "No public aid to parochial schools except shared services." Despite what has been said, or what is in evidence in this resolution, these people that I referred to earlier in the editorial from the weekly paper are banding together to fight for government aid to parochial schools, and they can have, Madam Speaker, in mind only one of three things: First of all, the changing of the government's mind on the matter of public aid to parochial schools; the changing of the Legislature's mind and thus resulting in the defeat of the government; or,

(Mr. Groves, cont'd). . . organizing on a religious basis for the next provincial election. The latter, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, seems to be the strategy as I see it, and we should watch this situation very carefully, for it means that we are going to have, or could have, serious difficulties in the months that lie ahead for the people of Manitoba. We have to ignore, Madam Speaker, when considering shared services in this light, many of the tracts, magazines and letters which are sent to us by members of the public, because we do not know how responsible they are or what may be their real moves. We certainly must, however, take cognizance of authoritative reports, such as the two Royal Commission reports that I read from earlier in my remarks, and two others that seem to come from persons of authority, and, Madam Speaker, I think I have one of these here. It's a document called: "Public Schools in Manitoba are non-sectarian." And it is written by a Reverend A. J. B. Cossette, O. M. I., Lynn Lake, Manitoba. Now I presume, although I'm not sure, that this gentleman is one of the lay brothers of one of the Orders of the Catholic church. Madam Speaker, he says a lot of things in this document that disturb me, and I will merely quote them to emphasize what I've said, that in addition to looking at shared services we have to take into consideration what authoritative people and organizations are doing and saying outside of this House. "Were it not for inflaming the ever-glowing embers of bigotry and for drawing whipping political reprisals, the Province of Manitoba could be sued for millions of dollars for violating The Public Schools Act." On page 2: "God is censored on the school steps outside, victim of the incantation separating church and state, and the red carpet is laid before the Good Lord's competitors." This is obviously no separation of agnosticism and the state, nor is there a separation of questionable literature and the state." Madam Speaker, I refute this because in 70 years of operating a public school system in Manitoba I think we've graduated some pretty prominent and some pretty God-fearing people. So I certainly would like to refute the fact that God is censored on the front steps of the public schools.

Then he goes on to say, "Atheists, materialists, Communists and non-Christians enjoy preferential treatment in the public schools by having all the tax money on their side. In order to share public benefits from one's own taxes, one is forced to join the ranks of the irreligious and submit to a curriculum of "take this or else." In the U. S. A. and in Manitoba that is the price of religious liberty, an expense spared the heathen, the sole protegee of the state." And remember, Madam Speaker, this is written by, not some nut, but by a member of a teaching order of the Roman Catholic Church. "Incredible is the approval of so many Protestant divines. So many of them create the impression that God is better served by being ignored and that it is more expedient for Christianity to concede all tax-supported public benefits to the irreligious rather than share them."

So, Madam Speaker, how can we consider even such a small step as shared services in a calm and dispassionate manner when such things as this are issued from places of authority? And, as I say, I'm ignoring the many other tracts and pieces of literature that come to me from people whose knowledge of the subject or those authority I question.

Now there was one other: "In all the loud bigotry against aid to private schools, no on in the Legislature, Liberal or Conservative, nor in the Department of Education, no school inspector, no school principal, no newspaper editor, no Protestant Church went on record to demand impartiality in the study of controversial matters."

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't know what goes on in the inner sanctum of the Department of Education, but if it does any good I can certainly state that as far as I'm concerned I believe in the public school and any place else that controversial matters should be studied in an impartial manner. And after all, Madam Speaker, I think that over a period of time, labour unions have had the same problem. After all, they also complain that sometimes our text books don't show labour unions in their real light; that they tend to go back to the early history of labour unions when the management-labour relations were spiced with violence. And I think that they have a case too, and that if our history books in the Province of Manitoba aren't treating the Reformation and the early problems of the Catholic Church and the early history of labour unions, I that they should be asked to do so. But this, to my mind, is not the way to bring this about.

And then finally: "It was on such legal grounds -- the religious half-hour remedial clause in The School Act is plain poetry. The concession is left to the discretion of school trustees, who

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)... may either deny, as they have done, or constantly argue the justification of what they consider an encroachment of the more important academic subjects, and for whom, the trustees, religion and superstition are synonymous. Principals never cease to negotiate for a reduction in the number of half hour religious instruction periods. When tolerated after much quibbling precious time is lost in the transferring assembly of the pupils who at the closing bell are perfunctorily shown out with God Save The Queen." Again I ask, Madam Speaker, how can we deal with this in a calm and dispassionate manner when we receive documents such as this from people in authority?

And finally, Madam Speaker, I want to deal with one other authority, and that's the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. He's been speaking at meetings as well. And here's what he says: "We should ignore the politicians and try and find another road, St. Boniface MLA Larry Desjardins said Sunday. Mr. Desjardins stated bluntly that politicians haven't done a thing to solve the separate school problem. The Liberal MLA recommended that the Committee of the House which Premier Roblin was setting up to investigate the shared services plan be ignored by the Catholic group because it would be starting from a set of principles opposed to direct aid to parochial schools."

So, Madam Speaker, I think that no matter how we're going to try to deal with this thing on its merit and in a calm and dispassionate manner, that this is not going to be our doing, but these things are going to be decided, that the way in which this is looked at is going to be decided by persons and by statements and by documents such as this that are made and issued outside of the confines of the Legislature. And it's unfortunate that it appears that we're going to have to set up a committee to review shared services in this type of an atmosphere. It's also unfortunate and regrettable that it appears that the advocates of private and parochial schools are organizing now on the basis of fighting the next provincial election on the school issue.

During the time that our committee is going to sit to consider this matter, Madam Speaker, I think that we must all search our hearts and our souls for the right answer, and I hope that those who constitute this committee can come back to this Chamber a year from now and give this answer to us. I don't hold out too much hope that they will bring in a complete answer or a final answer, but perhaps if we give them the chance, at least on the shared services plan that is under consideration they can bring us back recommendations that we can look at and perhaps accept in the spirit of at least trying to solve this problem that's been with this province for so many years. Thank you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question? Did he or didn't he say that in his mind the way this is worded that no one favouring aid to separate schools could in conscience vote for this motion?

MR. GROVES: What I said, Madam Speaker, was that no one who stated that by conscience they believed in state aid to parochial schools could subscribe to Item No. 1: the separation of church and state as that expression is understood in Manitoba; and 2: subscribe to the dedication of public funds to the support of a single public school system open to all children; and 3: they could not agree that this committee would be set up and that in its consideration of the aforesaid, adhere to the principles set out in the first preamble hereof.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the honourable member is in fact saying then -- this is what I want to get clear because he's read something that I've said -- he thinks this is awful. You said that nobody favouring aid to private schools could vote in favour....

MADAM SPEAKER: Could the honourable member Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS:..... of this motion -- right or wrong?

MR. GROVES: Nobody who is in that category could subscribe to those three passages which I read.

MR. SCHREYER: He says that he likes to put his cards on the table. I would like him to put his cards on the table for me when he says, when he refers to principle 1 -- what does he understand by the separation of church and state? Does he understand by it that if the state were to grant aid to all denominations that that would be joining church and state?

MR. GROVES: I think the Premier explained that when he introduced the resolution this afternoon, that it applies strictly to the school system in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the question is the adjournment of the debate by the Honourable Member for St. George.

MADAM SPEAKER: The seconder is not in his seat.

MR. ROBLIN: In that case, I think you had better move the adjournment again and have it properly done.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... Continued on next page.

MR. ROBLIN: I understand the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks would be agreeable to speaking on the resolution respecting the Dental Health policy now, and if so it would be appreciated if you would call that order of business.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Health, The Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, in rising to speak on this government resolution I feel like the fellow whose mother-in-law drove over a cliff in his new car -- my emotions are all so mixed. My first reaction is to oppose this resolution out of a feeling of lack of confidence in this government. The very fact that this resolution is before us is the admission on the part of this government that the amendments they proposed to the Dental Act in 1960 have not been sufficient to satisfy the citizens of this province.

Since 1960 there have been many prosecutions under the Act and much public dissatisfaction. It seems to me that an alert government, a government which claimed in the last election that it was the government that 'gets things done' -- I like to keep referring to this little pamphlet because it shows all the cabinet ministers with their shirt sleeves rolled up here and they are really trying to give the impression that they do get things done. Now if they were a government that gets things done they would have made a study long before now. One would have thought more notice would have been paid to the Paynter Report of 1956 -- and I'd like to read from page 15 Madam Speaker; this has to do with the whole question of ancillary assistance for dentists. On page 15 under "Training more ancillary personnel in the dental profession" and I'm quoting: 'It was reported in 41 that the average Canadian dentist gave treatment to about 1070 patients in the year 1953-54. In Manitoba the number was 1137. Furthermore this provided service for about 35 percent of the population. When such figures are translated into present and future population for this province, it means that if all the people were to receive the same service as those who are now getting it, Manitoba would now require some 745 dentists, an immediate addition of about 480; and in 25 years the province would require about 1100 dentists. This if it were possible would require training of vast numbers of dental personnel over the next few years, a very time consuming, expensive and unnecessary procedure.' I stress 'unnecessary procedure'. More people should be served by each dentist and this can be done only by increasing the number of hands he was available. In other words there should be a marked increase in the number of ancillary personnel used in practice. At the present time there is only one type of worker being trained -- the dental hygienist. Hygienists are girls with a minimum of two years training in a dental school following matriculation. After graduation they may be licensed to work in Manitoba and elsewhere in a dental office, public health units or institutions under supervision and to perform certain services in connection with dental practice. Their services are largely in the field of oral prophylaxis and education. It has been estimated that the use of a hygienist in a dental office increases the number of patients that a single dentist can serve in a year by about 40 percent. The services that a dental hygienist is able to perform are limited and it is the opinion of this writer that further types of ancillary personnel can and should be trained to relieve the dentist of many more of the laborious time-consuming, although valuable procedures which he is now required to perform in his office, thus freeing time which could more advantageously be used in diagnosis, treatment, and planning, etc.

The creation of such a program is new but inevitable. Leadership for it should properly come through the dental profession, specifically through dental education. And the idea is not new. It has been forecast by several leaders in the past; Dr. G. Edward Howe, President of the University of Western Ontario stated in 1951 -- and I quote: "Three years ago here I said that the changing concept of health is slow, so too is the tortoise, and progress can be made only when a sufficient number of people, again like the tortoise, are willing to stick out their necks. When are we, as supposedly smart men and women in the health professions, going to realize that we can either continue to give leadership in health or we can resist the changes which are inevitable and which people desire: and if we do the latter we simply lose the prestige and freedom which have been inherent in our professions in the past. If we are to take advantage of our present position and keep it where it belongs all we have to do is realize that a successful health service -- and that is what the public wants, either organized through health agencies or promoted through the recognition of newer responsibilities by the practitioners of the healing arts -- depends basically and primarily on medical education, dental education and nursing

(Mr. Wright cont'd) education."

A. Leroy Johnson, former Dean of the Harvard School of Dental Medicine has in his recent book "Dentistry as I See It Today" quoted as follows: "It is apparent that medical care including dentistry, can be made available on an adequate plane to the entire population only if traditional procedures are somewhat altered and adapted. The time and effort of men trained at great expense to society cannot be wasted on anything which can be safely delegated, under supervision, to those of lesser training." And Johnson himself expressed it, and I quote: "That the insertion of fillings, the construction and adaptation of crowns, bridges, and plates are valuable is beyond question. Nevertheless they are an expediency and exacting, time-consuming service, the demand for which is overwhelming and the cost beyond the reach of many. The dentist does what he was trained to do, does it well, more hands are needed; but to rest content with laurel thus gained, to revel in repair, compromises the status of dentistry as a profession. The profession exists to serve the public; its controlling motive is to shape its practice so as to serve more and more people and when it becomes dominated by the guild spirit in its cruder sense and is content with obvious insufficiency it fails to meet the obligations of a profession."

Madam Speaker, when this question of a triangle of dentists, dental technicians and denturists first came before us, I received considerable correspondence from my constituents asking me to support the denturists and I answered them by saying that this matter required a lot of study. This much I promised and set for myself certain rules: I must not ride on the bandwagon of organized public demand, even if it were politically enticing, before giving much study to the subject. (2) I must not do anything to hinder the construction of the Manitoba Dental College or the Faculty of Dentistry at the University or to discourage young people from enrolling in the Dentistry Course; (3) I would meet with both the denturists and dentists to hear their different views; and (4) I would talk to people the names of whom would be given me by both the dentists and the denturists.

And starting out I found there were two groups of dental mechanics, one called dental technicians who worked for the various dental laboratories on a sort of mass production basis. These mechanics had a wide range of skills but because they specialized more or less under the conditions that they worked they specialized in one operation and they did not as individuals have the all around skill of the denturist who did all operations including the taking of the impression.

I found too that the wages of the technicians working for the laboratories, which did the work for the dentist, were not as high as the earnings of the denturists. In 1960 I had hoped that the two groups would come together into one organization with a view of raising the standards of their vocation and also to bargain for a fair schedule of wages. This has not come about. It was my opinion then, that the dentists were keeping the laboratory technicians subservient to the desire to make money from dentures rather than treating them as an ancillary partner in the great cause of dental health. This attitude has in my opinion been the main reason for the existence of the denturists.

My second reaction is that of admiration for the dental profession in general; their attitude toward preventive education, fluoridation and the donation they make with their services to, or have made in the past to the various health units when they were beginning to function was most commendable. And I'm not as worried as the Honourable Member for St. Vital about their earnings. Most dentists work long hours; they work with people and pain. This can build up extreme tension, and they have no employer paying a share to a pension fund or to health and welfare benefits. I am more concerned about the quality of their work and how we are going to get more dentists, especially in our rural areas.

The Minister of Health in his submission to the Royal Commission on Health Services in 1962 said that there was only one dentist for every 6800 people in the rural areas, that is the area outside of Metro Winnipeg. He also said that only 16 percent of children starting school at age six had received proper dental care and that 60 percent were growing up with some type of malformation of the teeth and jaws.

The new Faculty of Dentistry at the University of Manitoba has been the first bright spot to show in trying to solve this enormous problem. The next was the opening of the Portage Avenue Dental Clinic, operated by the Manitoba Dental Association where first class service I understand, is available to all and where a complete set of dentures can be purchased for \$85.00. I

(Mr. Wright cont'd) think we have reached the point now where this government will have to do more planning for the future on this subject of Dental Health -- and here I am reminded again of that classic definition of Stuart Chase's about the word 'planning'. He says it is intelligent co-operation with the inevitable. This government must face the inevitable fact that people are now regarding proper health care as a practical objective in this second half of the 20th century. It must find a way to get our dentists into rural areas, even if it has to subsidize those willing to go there; and there is no doubt, that a much more broad-minded attitude towards the training and the greater use of ancillary personnel will have to be adopted.

Madam Speaker, it is with this fervent hope that I believe even at this late date, that a special committee can perform a service of lasting benefit to the people of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Dufferin that the debate be adjourned.

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 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 VIII, item 2 (I) Psychiatric Services, passed.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I mentioned when I spoke on the Minister's salary that I'd be asking him questions about psychiatric nurses or registered psychiatric nurses that they have at Selkirk and General Hospital. It mentioned in the Order of Return the number of psychiatric nurses at Selkirk and the trainees and the separations. Now I don't know of the separations whether they were trainees or whether they were mostly people that had graduated and were registered psychiatric nurses. I would like the Minister to answer that for me. I also understand that he's on a campaign, recruiting psychiatric nurses, I understand in Great Britain. I don't think that they have a surplus of registered psychiatric nurses in Great Britain. I was just wondering who are they recruiting? Are they recruiting practical nurses or are they recruiting anyone that wants to come to Canada? Those are the questions I'd like answered at this time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would like some of the other questions before he answers? If he'd rather do it the other way, it's all right with me. I think that I have a reputation in the House, Mr. Chairman, that I'm not usually advocating increased expenditures and frequently am checking the amount of money that is spent; but I think that the record will show that this is one service where I have never been critical of the amount that is expended, because I have been encouraged by the reports that have been given year in and year out as to the results that are obtained, and recently, in fact, in the Free Press of March 12th there is a Health Week message reading with the larger headline saying, "Treatment Successful for Mental Patients." This does not emanate from the department here but rather from the Canadian Mental Health Association. It, once again aroused my interest in this particular question and I would like, if it has not already been given, the Minister to review some of the figures as to how the admissions and the discharges from the mental hospitals are coming along.

I saw recently a report -- I don't think it was this one -- but another one that said that four out of five people who enter the institutions now are discharged within a year. Now I know that it's hard to tie down some of the statistics. I know that there are some people who go regularly into the institutions. Is one of those persons who goes regularly into the institution, perhaps checking in every six months, let us say -- I presume he is considered just as one person, not as two admissions. I would like to know the basis on which these figures are kept as to how many new patients go in and how many of those go out?

Now in this question of cost, I carried forward once again the same thing that the First Minister and I were talking about a few evenings ago, and while we are talking of psychiatry services in general, I want to give the figures as I have taken them from the present estimates and estimates of years back -- the same years as a matter of fact that I was speaking of a few evenings ago. You will notice under the Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases, this is on the

(Mr. Campbell cont'd) next page, but it is under psychiatric services, we have a net figure there, so far as salaries, supplies, expenses, less board of two million and a half in round figures. I checked as to what that figure was in 1959 -- it's \$2½ million now, it was \$1 million and a little less than a half in 1959. In 1953, taking it the same distance back again, a six year space in each case, it was just over \$1 million. Now those figures in themselves would certainly not indicate a decrease in the number of patients. Similarly in Selkirk, the figure here is \$2, 128, 000 odd; in 1959 estimate it was \$1, 156, 000 even; in 1953 it was \$694, 000.00. And once again I want to make it plain I'm not criticizing these expenditures. This is one place where I hold that if we can restore these folks to their normal way of life, this is a service that certainly deserves full support, I'm aware of the fact that even though these figures would indicate that the numbers are not being cut down, I certainly am conscious that costs have risen and no doubt the cost of keeping a patient in the institution for a given length of time is much more now than it was back in '53 or even '59. In that connection I would like the Minister sometime to give us what is the cost per patient nowadays in the institutions, by the day, or the month or the year as he wishes. But the main story that I would like to get Mr. Chairman is how are we doing actually as far as restoring these folk to their normal way of life; with a given number of admissions going into the hospital what is the average stay; how many of the ones who came in in a given year have gone out again within one year's time, within two year's time; how many haven't got out for several years time.

Now I don't know that asking questions will elicit the whole story that can be told in here, but it is the story that I would like to get on the record as far as possible. If the Minister has a comparison with the hospital population of a few years ago, and what they are now, I'd be glad to have them too.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer first the questions that were posed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Most of the nurses that are leaving after graduation, I find about 70 percent of them are leaving because they get married. But we don't exactly lose them because after a period of time, after they have been married they return back into the services of the hospital as registered psychiatric nurses. Of the others, we lose quite a number to the hospitals here in Winnipeg that have psychiatric wards. The institutions of the department are the only institutions that are training psychiatric nurses and so we do have a drain-off take place from the hospitals here in Winnipeg and in other places where they have psychiatric wards.

With respect to the recruitment of people from Great Britain, we are recruiting mainly people who have degrees over there, as registered mental nurses and people who have a combination of degrees as registered nurses and registered mental nurses and another combination of persons who has actually been in the education field in both of these areas. But in every case, particularly in the case of the psychiatric nurses, these nurses have to be licensed by the licensed psychiatric nurses of Manitoba and meet the standards of the licensed psychiatric nurses of Manitoba. I understand that some 17 of them have come across at the present time. I believe that is the figure -- it would require checking. But the big point to remember, I believe, is they are licensed in Great Britain but despite that, they have to meet the standards and be licensed by the psychiatric nurses here in Manitoba.

In attempting to answer the questions of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I think possibly it might be helpful to say to him that I think it is rather difficult to obtain for him an average length of stay in the mental institutions in the province because the mental institutions in their working capacity have changed over the years. They are no longer domiciliary institutions so much as they are active acute treatment centres that operate very active out-patient and in-patient departments. With the community mental health operations they are going out into the field to see many people who are mentally disturbed in the field and to take what treatment is necessary there to try to keep these people in their homes as much as possible, or in foster homes, and also to provide approved medication to people who will look after them. Many of the people who come to the hospital as referrals, particularly at Brandon and Selkirk and here in Winnipeg, are people who are treated as out-patients as much as possible, are not taken into the institution unless it is absolutely necessary. And then, I understand now at Selkirk they feel that with inside of about three months that they can discharge most of the people that come into them with mental diseases through the use of such matters as electro-therapy, electro-shock

(Mr. Witney cont'd) therapy and insulin treatment and other types of occupational therapy that are being utilized to a considerable extent.

Perhaps the figures will be of interest to him. In 1963 the Brandon, Selkirk and Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute had under treatment as in-patients a total of 4,458. The direct admission to these hospitals reached an all-time high of 1,679, which was an increase of 146, or approximately ten percent over 1962. I understand over the past three years that there has been an increase of approximately 36 percent in the admissions into the psychiatric institutes in the province. I further understand that -- as I interpret these figures, since 1958 there has been a decrease of patient population in the mental hospitals of 609. In 1963 we were able to return to the community a ten percent greater number than we had been able to return to the community in 1962. I got a little lost on these figures at times. Admissions to the psychiatric institute in 1963 were 884; to the Brandon Mental Hospital were 489; and to the Selkirk Mental Hospital were 657. That gave the direct number of admissions as 1,679 compared with the total of the previous year 1962 of 1,533. The total under treatment as at the end of '63 was 4,458; and the total of the previous year was 4,470. The total separations from these areas in 1963 was 1,894 compared to 1,717 in 1962. I trust that those figures will be of some value to the honourable member in trying to assess the value of the treatment.

I think it is important to remember the treatment activities of the hospitals has changed over a period of time. They are endeavouring as much as possible to not have people institutionalized but to be treated as out-patients. Some people are brought in in the night and kept in the institutions at night so that various therapies can be given to them and then they can be discharged to go to their normal occupation during the daytime, or possibly to a foster home or to their own homes. I did recall some figures that I had the other day that the number of interviews that had taken place in the out-patients' activities was 17,236, which is up from 16,497 in 1962.

The cost, of course, reflects not simply the numbers of people that are coming into the institute as I understand them, but they are also reflecting the cost of the new aspects in psychiatry -- for instance in the community of mental health work with the teams that go out into the country, the type of people that comprise these teams; they reflect the increases in cost in social services in the various institutes whereby the patient is interviewed and the relatives of the patient are interviewed, all of the various services that are possible are brought to bear towards assisting of the patient itself. This is a new area apparently which has been developed over the past years to quite an intensive type of activity in order to treat the mental patient with as much of the resources, not only of the hospital, but of the community as possible.

And then, of course, in the various rehabilitation fields the increase in activity there is causing an increase in the cost of the operation of the hospitals. There have been increases in such matters as food; increases in renovations and various items of a smaller nature such as that.

With respect to the cost per patient, I'm sorry I cannot give the honourable member that figure but I will obtain it for him.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that it's not easy to give exact answers in this area and I read from this article that I mentioned a short time ago where Dr. Griffin of the Canadian Mental Health Association is reported as saying, "That an encouraging note is a recent release by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which indicates disabling mental illness requiring long-term hospital care is slowly but steadily declining." And this seems to be the trend in general. I realize, too, that as the patients' stays are shorter that perhaps that releases the psychiatrist to have more time to spend with the patients than they had before and perhaps it will be some little time yet before we can look for a decrease in the costs of the institutions compared to the apparent decrease in the length of stay of the patient. I recognize that those aren't necessarily comparable figures that can be given, but I would think with the encouraging statements that have been made by well-qualified people that we could at least be hoping that the time is about here when instead of the costs of these institutions rising each year -- and I've not been complaining about the cost -- that we could expect a levelling off perhaps and maybe in time to come some reduction.

Then the other thing I wanted to ask my honourable friend was the question of the much advertised drugs that are being used these times. I have the feeling the first uses of them were rather as tranquilizers and sedatives than because of any therapeutic value; but are there

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) some now that are really held to have some considerable restorative value in addition to the sedation or tranquility that they induce?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I want to just add a few remarks before the Minister answers. He could probably comment on what I have to say as well.

I have here a report from the Health Service and Hospital Insurance from B. C. and they, too, are working apparently along the lines as the Minister just outlined, that they are trying to do more and more for the mentally ill and also in the matter of out-patients being dealt in that way. And further on in the report they make some remarks in connection with the personnel, and I'd like to read this one particular paragraph which reads this way: "The problems of mental health centre primarily in the availability of trained staff such as psychiatrists, psychologists and psychiatric social workers. All of these highly skilled professionals are in short supply although our training programs produces enough psychiatric nurses. This shortage, we feel in British Columbia, is felt all the way across Canada as well as in the United States. The truth of the matter is that our society is not yet encouraging enough people to seek this field of activity for a career and yet it is perhaps the greatest single requirement in the overall area of health care."

My question would be: what are we doing in encouraging people to enter this career? Are we giving these people anything in the way of bursaries, or contributing toward their taking courses to become qualified to serve in this way? Perhaps we could stand some improvement in this area and I would certainly like to hear from the Minister whether we are doing anything in this way to attract people to enter this career.

MR. WITNEY: I'd like to just comment a bit briefly to the Honourable Member for Lakeside and say that I regret that I can't see the cost levelling off for a while as yet in psychiatry because it appears that more people are coming to us now. It is my understanding that the stigma that used to be attached to it is no longer there; it is being treated more or less as a normal disease, so more people are coming to us than ever came before. And, of course, as they do these are people that we did not know were there. I did have a comment made to me at one time by one of our men that really we are at the end of bricks and mortar and now we are to concentrate on the patients themselves with all the modern methods that we have, particularly in therapy.

But for the years to come, and I wouldn't like to say how many, I think we can only expect that our costs will still continue to rise because we are still experiencing shortage of staff to meet the numbers of people that keep coming in to the various institutions.

The drug therapy has apparently had remarkable effects in the field of mental diseases. In acute treatment of people with mental diseases drug therapy has enabled the discharge of people much more rapidly than ever before; and not only that under instruction it has enabled the patient to be kept in foster homes and in his own home by the training of people in the medication that is necessary and the providing of the drugs. I am advised that the recent drug therapies that have been developed over the past few years have saved hundreds of lives and saved much needless misery among these unfortunate people.

With respect to the question of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, a great deal of in-training of people is done in our mental institutions. In our Psychiatric Institute here in Winnipeg, at the Brandon Hospital and at the Selkirk Hospital, at the Winnipeg hospital there is a considerable amount of in-training of people for psychiatry, not only for nurses but also for doctors. We train all the nurses -- as I mentioned to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, we train all the psychiatric nurses in the province at the present time. We also see to it that our own staff are able to take extra-curricular activities to find out more about the problems they are dealing with. The University is beginning to provide us with more trained people and we do have a bursary system available for the training of nurses, psychiatric nurses, and those people who want to go in for psychiatry in general.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I have one question more that slipped my mind when I was speaking before. What I would like to know -- I've been told that we don't have enough staff at the Selkirk Mental Hospital, that they have a new ward or a new wing there and they can't operate it because they haven't got the staff to operate it. I wonder if the Minister could tell me if this is true or not or is this just something that

MR. WITNEY: There is always difficulty in obtaining trained people because of the

(Mr. Witney cont'd) pressures that have developed in psychiatry in the past few years, as I mentioned with more people coming to the psychiatric institute. The Psychiatric Institute at Selkirk will be in operation this year and the estimates do reflect monies for staff for those people. I was out to see the superintendent on Sunday, of the Institute at Selkirk, and he did not indicate to me at that time that he anticipated undue difficulties in staffing for the new centre.

MR. PETERS: I wonder if the Minister would arrange a trip again for the members of the Legislature to go out to Selkirk Mental Hospital.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, as soon as the new centre is open I think it would be very advantageous for those members to go to see it. I will be very happy to take the members to the Selkirk Institute to take a look over the new facilities when they are open. Possibly at the time of the opening, or near that particular time we might be able to round up sufficient of the members to provide a trip that will be of interest to them and I trust stimulating.

MR. PETERS: guarantee return?

MR. HILLHOUSE: At their own risk, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WITNEY: The Honourable Member for Selkirk says they will have to go at their own risk and I will guarantee no return.

MR. CHAIRMAN: to say the day that we finish the estimates?

2 (a) (1) Psychiatric Services; Administration.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I suppose that you do intend to call all of the items here because 2 would take us clean through the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're in Psychiatric Services, and (1) Administration.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Then you are going to call (1) and a, b and so on all the way down? Well now, Mr. Chairman, some member asked a question in July 14, 1959. I refer you to Hansard No. 25 of that day -- that's five years ago, and it says "Mr. Johnson (Gimli) answered -- and I think he was the Minister at that time. Mr. Johnson: "Mr. Chairman, he says, there was a few questions that I feel should be answered that came up in my estimates today, in the Health Estimates, and I said that I would get this information: 1. How many children are there waiting to get into the Portage la Prairie Home, the Portage Mental Hospital? Here is his answer -- "There are 156 boys and 119 girls on our waiting list. The other question I think I probably gave the House the wrong impression concerning the supply for the psychiatrists in the province, and I would just like to bring that into perspective, that at the present time there are 27 full-time doctors in the service in our mental hospitals, 14 of whom are fully qualified as specialists. We are also determined there are 40 psychiatrists altogether in the province, that's including the men in our mental institutions." Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the same question to him: What are the figures today? -- the corresponding figures today? The same man can answer it if he likes. It doesn't matter to me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't often quote a paper from Saskatchewan, but here's one, the Leader-Post, Regina, March 6, 1964, the heading is "The Brain Drain", and it goes on to say that Canada is losing all of its top brains to United States. The article is headed Ottawa and I suppose that these are Canadian figures. They may be all going from Saskatchewan, I don't know -- but here's the alarming thing -- out of a total -- (interjection) -- It's pretty short. I could. "The extent of Canada's 'brain drain' to the United States was indicated Wednesday in statistics tabled in the Commons." Apparently the question was asked by the Honourable David Orlikow, formerly of Winnipeg. Here's the answer that he got, anyway: "Engineers led the exodus. The number leaving in the most recent year totalled 894. Among them were 150 electrical engineers, 103 civil engineers, 93 mechanical engineers, 51 aeronautical engineers." Now there were 467 physicians and surgeons -- 467 Canadian physicians and surgeons took off in this exodus to United States. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if there is something that we can do outside of paying them a lot more money to keep them here -- or is this the reason, Mr. Chairman, that they are all going down south, that they are making twice as much money? This is quite a number. If we educate -- I don't know how many physicians and surgeons that graduate every year in Canada, but if there is 467 that graduate every year that go down south, it seems to me we are losing a great percentage of them. I wonder if my honourable friend could give us the figure -- the number that graduated in Canada, say last year or the year before.

Mr. Chairman, while my honourable friend is hunting up the answers to a couple of those questions, I wonder -- I was out of the House on Friday evening in the snowstorm and I notice

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) on page 3 of the Speech from the Throne, last paragraph, it states: "A new Elderly and Infirm Person's Housing Act will be submitted." Has it been submitted yet? Mr. Chairman, I suppose they will say that this should not be raised until we have reached the Welfare estimates, but I find it very difficult to separate these two departments. I know my honourable friends are finding it the same way -- that there is a connection some way between Health and Welfare. You just can't separate them: it is nearly impossible to talk about one without talking about the other. I wonder if this new Act has been submitted to us at this time -- up to this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: items. Now we're dealing only with Psychiatric Services.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, there's one question I'd like to assist the Minister of Health with in this regard because this is detail which certainly he can look up in time but having been around that department for a while I think I could answer the Member from Neepawa quickly. There were these large waiting lists -- and there still are waiting lists I imagine to the Portage Home -- but I would point out to the Member from Neepawa that from about '58 the estimates for the maintenance of many of these children in their own homes outside of institutions has risen as he notes up to half a million this year, this was around 67,000 in 1958. This is the policy of doing what is possible to encourage parents to keep children at home rather than institutionalize them. These are children who are certified to be defective and in many cases the parents with a little assistance are able to keep these children at home. That also includes the St. Amant Ward which started out with about 25 children in the old Hospice Tache a few years back which we thought would grow to 75 and is now handling 125 children under the age of six. Until that became an expanded program children under six were not taken -- children under six were left at home. I would like to emphasize that these growth strides, also the increased expenditures, the Minister is promoting with respect to the Broadway Home, the increased activities of that institution in getting the higher grade retarded children out of Portage and back into the community. Significant strides have been made in these areas. The exact figures as to how many children are actually on the waiting list who are not receiving some sort of support is something I think the Minister would have to get a special figure on. It isn't in the table here.

The supply of doctors -- I would point out both with respect to the question from the Member from Rhineland and Neepawa with respect to psychiatry, in recent years significant strides have been made. It is quite true that no matter how many incentives are given to psychiatrists to remain in the province of Manitoba, or doctors in general, without the working conditions and the challenge of a program and seeing that they can achieve something money alone is not the answer. Specifically the estimates that are before you by the Minister have been designed to bring about and to keep up with the most modern techniques in Canada and to give to the physicians who chose this career, a challenge to stay in our province and practice. In addition to the David A. Stuart bursary program where any medical student who can show his need and is approved by the dean receives substantial bursary assistance, provided he remains in the Province of Manitoba -- in addition to those bursaries to go through school on graduation, if he joins the Department of Health and Psychiatry. He starts off with a very good salary plus working in the hospital on a four-year diploma course program which takes him to the hospitals mentioned by the Minister including children's work in Winnipeg and at the Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute in General Hospital and St. Boniface. After this well-rounded program he has training second to none in Canada and receives the very highest degrees. In that connection in the past year, salaries for psychiatrists who recognize this training have been brought into effect and the top psychiatrist in this province today is receiving a very substantial salary.

These are the steps -- very progressive steps in the last few years that were taken by the government to bring our position in Manitoba into line. In addition to this, the challenge to the men in these hospitals with outgoing community orientated programs, using the very latest techniques drugs and so on, are in force in this province and the centre which the Minister referred to at Selkirk will be a first in this province as an area community mental health centre, active treatment centre, which will be opened up. I think all these measures in those fields where we have our greatest need, that is, in mental illness are certainly being met and that is the item that is under study now. There are more psychiatrists today in our hospitals under community health programs I believe than ever before. The exact figures we haven't got.

(Mr. Johnson cont'd)

Of course I point out to the Member from Neepawa that I think it is quite impossible for Canadian Universities and Hospitals to compete with our cousins south of the line, and that's why we have to have both the challenge of an interesting program in addition to adequate salaries. Some of the salaries down there for our top people -- they're paid almost double. I think we are very fortunate in that our top people have been so dedicated to their work and are getting such tremendous results. But I honestly felt in my time that they were appreciative of the opportunity to have more freedom within their work in recent years and certainly they are cutting the mustard. I think we in Manitoba should be happy that the head of our Selkirk Hospital, Dr. Tavener was this year's president of the Canadian Psychiatric Association. He and Dr. Johnson, the other superintendent are recognized across North America for their achievements. One only has to mention Share or Selkirk Workshop which is now in effect -- these come from our Selkirk Hospital. One only has to mention the Home Care Program carried out with the Canadian Mental Health Association in last years, and one only has to mention that despite this tremendous volume and increase in patient care, the number of patients in Selkirk Mental Hospital which was 1,250 for some years, is down below 1,000 patients -- as in-patients and I think this shows the kind of activity that has been going on in this field.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I asked three specific questions -- I appreciate my honourable friend's comments because they certainly were well put -- but I did ask these three questions, you will recall: the number of psychiatrists on staff today; the number of boys and girls on the waiting list; the number of graduate physicians, surgeons, psychiatrists, annually, and whether or not this new Elderly and Infirm Persons Housing Act has been submitted to the House. Now I guess there are about five questions there and despite the 15 minutes discourse I am still at a loss for an answer to these questions. I wonder if we could have them. Maybe my honourable friend the Minister is still looking them up, or maybe he'd like to bring them in tomorrow. But it would be helpful if we had these questions I think because -- particularly the one on the number of physicians and surgeons and psychiatrists that graduate. If there's half of them going down to the States then there must be something wrong. According to this article there's 467 physicians and surgeons alone, not psychiatrists, 467 physicians and surgeons left this last year.

MR. WITNEY: I have not got the figures that the honourable member is asking for immediately at hand. I will get them tomorrow.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have a request to make of the Minister. This doesn't necessarily mean an answer now, but I have a suggestion. In the 1962 annual report of the Health Department mention was made of the link between dental health and mental health and I would just like to quote briefly here. The report states that "dental health is a major public health issue and should receive top priority. It is felt that one of the reasons for our increase in mental disease is the impact of dental disease among our people." I wish next year that they would enlarge a little bit because it is a very interesting point.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, before we get off this subject, I would like to tell the Legislature and through the Legislature to Dr. Tavener at Selkirk Mental Hospital and let him know how lucky we are that we do have such a dedicated man as Dr. Tavener, because I do know that had he chose to leave us he could have left us to go south of the line at almost three times the salary that he is getting here. I want to say thank you to Dr. Tavener and his dedication to the service of the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) Administration, passed; (2) Brandon Hospital, passed; (3) Selkirk Hospital, passed; (4) Manitoba School for Mentally Defective, passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should pass No. 4 at the present time. There's a couple of questions that I want to ask of the Minister, either him or the previous Minister, dealing with the question of the Manitoba School for Mentally Defective Persons. I presume that this is the proper place to have a discussion on the St. Amant Ward at the Old St. Boniface Sanatorium. If it's not, then maybe my friend the Minister could tell me where better to discuss this question. -- (interjection) -- Pardon.

MR. WITNEY: 6 (c) is St. Amant Ward, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: ... 6 (c)?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Maintenance of Mental Defectives outside provincial institutions.

MR. PAULLEY: All right then, we'll just wait until we get down there.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, now we're there. I want to know from my honourable friend, what the Government of Manitoba proposes to do in respect of St. Amant Hospital for the next ensuing 12-month period. The very first speech I ever made in the Legislature of Manitoba was made in respect of the old Youville Hospital in the then Town of Transcona. I was pleased at that time to support the motion which was then proposed by the honourable member for Wolseley, said individual now being the Premier of the Province of Manitoba.

At that time, many of our unfortunate young children were confined to Youville Hospital in the Town of Transcona, an old farm house that was converted into a sort of a semi-hospital by Mrs. St. Amant of Transcona. As a result of aid from the Lions and Kiwanis Clubs of St. Boniface, many of the accoutrements in the hospital were improved upon. Subsequently because of the larger enrollment the facilities were moved from Transcona to the Hospital Tache in St. Boniface and eventually due to the declining population at the Sanatorium in St. Vital, provisions were made for the accommodation of unfortunate young people, particularly Mongoloids and the like at the Sanatorium.

I want to give the Government of Manitoba credit for the steps that they have taken up until this time. These have been appreciated very much by the parents whose children are unfortunately mentally retarded, or Mongoloid children. But today, Mr. Chairman -- and I hope the two Ministers are listening -- today, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately there are fears and apprehensions of many of the parents of children who are domiciled at the present time in the St. Amant ward, what we used to call the old St. Boniface Sanatorium.

Recently, I'm informed that there has been a considerable number of transfers from the St. Amant Ward to the Home for the Mentally Retarded at Portage la Prairie. I want to say to the Minister that I think he should investigate this matter thoroughly, because it's my opinion, and not shared just simply by myself, that when we're dealing with a mentally retarded child, or Mongoloid child, we cannot deal with them on the basis of age. Age is not a factor because we can have children who may be in years after birth of eight, nine, ten and twelve, but insofar as their mental capacities are concerned are only children of one or two or three, and I'm sure the Minister of Health recognizes this. But it seems to me that there has been in the last year or two, unfortunately, an idea of the department and its personnel to look more at the birth certificate of the individual than at the mental capability of the individual. As a net result, Mr. Chairman, a considerable number of individuals have been transferred from the St. Amant Ward in St. Boniface to Portage la Prairie.

Now I don't have to tell my honourable friend that I appreciate very much the work that the department is doing insofar as psychiatric treatment is concerned in the field of having community centres where those unfortunately afflicted with these diseases are kept. I think the previous Minister of Health used to tell us that the new outlook insofar as psychiatric treatment was concerned was away from the large hospitals of confinement into smaller community centres -- and I agree, and everything that I read seems to substantiate this. But I'm disturbed, Mr. Chairman, with the information that has been forwarded to me that with these children more and more of them are being transferred out of the St. Amant Ward out to Portage la Prairie. Now this might not be bad, this might not be bad if the family resided in Portage la Prairie or in the adjacent area; but unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the number of people who are talking to me about this are located in the Greater Winnipeg area and have to now travel to Portage to be near their youngsters.

I'm also informed that the good Sisters who are in charge -- and I believe it's the Grey Nuns who are in charge of the Sanatorium, and they're associated also with St. Boniface Hospital and the Old Folks Home as we generally call it, Hospice Tache on Tache Avenue -- have X numbers of dollars that they have accumulated in order to spend for hospital expansion, and at the present time they're not quite sure of the direction in which their monies are going to go. They certainly cannot, so I am informed, be in a position where they will be able to utilize this money three ways because of the policy. I take it, of having to have the necessary 20 percent here, there or there for expansion. It seems to me that the situation, or at least so I am informed, that the situation is that there is no further expansion contemplated for St. Amant Ward in the St. Boniface Sanatorium. I want to ask my honourable friend is this the case, because

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) a moment ago the Member for Gladstone resurrected an old document back to 1959 when he was talking about waiting lists for children for admittance to some of these facilities for care, and I would suggest that the situation is still much about the same, because while we have made some progress in certain areas -- and this was what I was meaning when I was speaking this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, on the question of priorities with the taxpayers' dollar -- we haven't made too much advancement, and despite what my honourable friend and now Minister of Education talks about the firsts of Manitoba and this progressive province, I still think that I could convince my honourable friend otherwise privately if I can't convince him in this Assembly. But notwithstanding this, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friends opposite, and I'm referring now to the two Ministers just kitty-corner across the Assembly from me, that there are genuine fears and apprehensions, not only of the people whose children are in the St. Amant Ward today, worrying of the possibility of their transfer out to Portage la Prairie -- and I'm sure my friends will agree that even though it's only 52 miles away, it's not quite as simple as going down on a Sunday afternoon or an evening to spend with the children in the location in my constituency of Radisson at the St. Boniface Sanitorium -- that there are fears and apprehensions, Mr. Chairman, of the present, and it seems to me an accelerating number of transfers on the basis of age and size from St. Amant Ward out to Portage la Prairie. I have not heard and they have not heard of any plans of the government now for expansion of the facilities in the St. Amant Ward.

And when I'm speaking of the St. Amant Ward, Mr. Chairman, I want to pay a tribute once again to the Knights of Columbus who annually hold a tea, at which I'm honoured to pour tea as well as the former Minister of Health -- we poured tea on one or two occasions together -- that the Knights of Columbus use their efforts there to get together a few extra dollars, and I might say this is a well-patronized tea and I respectfully suggest to the Members of this Legislature that if they see an advertisement in the paper that the tea is being held -- and it's usually held in the early spring -- bring around their ten or fifteen bucks. It will be welcomed by the Knights of Columbus but more particularly the Auxiliary to the St. Amant Ward -- so I invite them right now and I'm not a Knight of Columbus. But nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, there are these fears and apprehensions at the present time with the parents of the children in the hospital at the present time. I'm sure that the Minister knows that there still is a large waiting list from parents who would like to have their children in the accommodation at the St. Amant and I would like to hear from the Minister a full detailed outlined program that the department has in respect of these unfortunate children.

Now having said this I realize, and I don't want the Minister -- and I don't think he will, Mr. Chairman -- I don't want the Minister standing up and saying to me, "Well don't you agree, doesn't the member agree that the proper place for these children is where they can have the loving care at home with their parents?" This has been said in this House once before. I would agree with this, Mr. Chairman, if this was an only child, but certainly where there are a number of normal children in a household and one who is unfortunately in the category of those children for whom I hope that I'm speaking, that this is not possible. So I ask my honourable friend the present Minister of Health: are the people who are talking to me about the fears that they have of transfer of their children to Portage la Prairie justified? Is the Department of Health taking into consideration, not the factor of age but of mentality, and what plans has this forward-looking government got for future expansion for an ever-expanding population of children who are mentally defective and our Mongoloid children in the Province of Manitoba? I think these are vital questions and I'm sure that the Minister of Health appreciates this and should be prepared, or is prepared to answer this. And I sincerely trust and hope, Mr. Chairman, that when the Honourable the Minister of Health rises to answer these points he'll say, "Well I can assure the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party that this ever-considerate, every-progressive government has got all the factors under consideration and indeed not only under consideration but I can promise my honourable friend that new excavations, if necessary, will be made this summer to assure the people of these unfortunate children that they don't have to go out of Winnipeg and that our accommodation will be expanded for the waiting list which we have at the present time." This is the answer, Mr. Chairman, I want from my honourable friend. I now ask him what his answer actually will be.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the item under discussion I think is too important to make

(Mr. Witney cont'd) any political type of statement at all. These children are

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this was not a political type if he was referring to the remarks that I was making because they were from the heart having followed this whole matter from the days when I was just a well little ordinary citizen back in the now City of Transcona.

MR. WITNEY: I, of course, had representations about the St. Amant Ward too, even before I became the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, for I know people who have a child in the St. Amant Ward. I can only say with respect to that at the present time that this is tied up with the negotiations that are going on at the present time with the Sisters in connection with the whole of the St. Boniface complex, which I mentioned the other night during the general debate on the Minister's salary, and that there has been a whole series of negotiations being conducted over the past year or so with the Sisters. It is my understanding that they will be here sometime before the end of March to come to some decisions with the department about the whole of the complex of St. Boniface. I regret that that is about as far as I can go at the present time in relation to the St. Amant Ward.

During the past year the numbers of children there did increase slightly to 135; that in the estimates that we are discussing at the present time provision is being made for increased amounts of money to go to the St. Amant Ward, mainly in increase per diem costs, but also for the provision of a pediatrican service to the St. Amant Ward. At one time apparently it was done as a free service by the pediatricians, mainly I believe from the St. Boniface Hospital, but the numbers of children and the work load has come to the point now where we have to provide for some more adequate means.

I might say with respect to Portage that with the cottage system that will be placed into operation in this coming year, that the cottage system will be utilizing areas where there will be no more than about 30 of these people and we will be able to provide for a greater degree of the type of socialization that is being done in the St. Amant Ward at the present time; and also in providing rehabilitation activities that will make life a bit more comfortable for these particular people.

But I think the direct answer to the honourable member's question with respect to St. Amant Ward is that I cannot go any further than to say the negotiations with the Sisters of St. Boniface have been going on and when they come, sometime near the end of March or later, I trust we will be able to conclude these negotiations and to know where we are going.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Honourable the Minister but I do want to say this, and as I said when I was raising the question, and he has reiterated it really, when he said that the Sisters concerned, or the Order concerned have more than one iron in the fire, so as to speak, I believe it is the same institution that looks after the Hospice Tache, the St. Boniface Hospital, and also the St. Amant Ward. I think I said that they had somewhere in the neighborhood of 300,000 -- I don't know if the figure is accurate or not -- but anyway they have X numbers of dollars that they have to spend three different ways.

The Minister tells me that he is going to meet with them shortly and have a discussion with them as to matching grants and this, that and the other, and a decision will have to be made as to what direction the expenditure is going to be made in. Now I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Health, supposing it is decided that the direction is going to be the addition of additional homes to St. Boniface Hospital. Supposing the direction that is going to be decided on is in respect of the Hospice Tache for the elderly citizens on Tache Street. What then? What then, I ask, Mr. Chairman, will be the situation in regards to the children not only at the present time in the St. Amant Ward, but of the children who are now on the waiting list? I can appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that I may be asking some embarrassing questions at the present time because of the fact that the negotiations haven't been conducted with the Reverend Sisters. But then again, does this not come down to the basic philosophy of expansion of hospitals in general in the whole area of hospitalization where before anything is done, a certain proportion of the monies have to be raised by contributions of one sort or another.

I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, that the very first speech that I made in this House dealt with the resolution of the First Minister and Youville Hospital. He was determined then that there should be an improvement in the lot of the children. He was convinced then that there should be expansion of the facilities, and I give him full credit that as soon as he had the opportunity to do something about it -- him and the government, Mr. Minister, of which you're

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) the Minister of Health, I give you full credit because you did it, and he did it, and I am sure the parents of the children I refer to are thankful you did. But I again pose to you, what are you going to do in the event that after your deliberations with the Sisters concerned, that it is decided to increase bed facilities at the St. Boniface Hospital to the Hospice Tache? What are you going to do in respect of the children? Are you just going to turn around and say, "Well, we are going to throw our dollars for new hospital beds and you children are going to go without, or at least your circumstances are going to remain the same as they are at the present time." These are the questions, Mr. Chairman, and this is what I want from the Minister.

Now having said this, having said this, Mr. Chairman, realizing the position that the Honourable the Minister of Health is in at the present time of the allocation of funds and negotiations between the Sisters, I can appreciate that if he stood up and said to me tonight, "Well, my friend" -- and I'm sure I'm his friend -- but if he stood up and said, "Well now my friend, if the Sisters don't proceed with the expansions that are necessary at the St. Amant Ward, you can rest assured that we will agree to it." I don't think my friend under the present financial arrangements or hospitalization in Manitoba is in a position to say this. So I won't pursue this, but I do want my honourable friend to realize the situation that is present now that the Order -- I respect them -- that have taken as their responsibility the operation of these three institutions, only have so many dollars to spend. And I want to say to my honourable friend the Minister of Health, have your negotiations and your discussions with the Sisters concerned and then if as a result of these discussions it is decided that the money will be spent other than at St. Amant Ward, that you, Mr. Minister, get in touch with the man who prompted me to make my first speech in this Legislature, namely the Premier, and say that we will not let the children down at St. Amant; and we will not support more and more children, as it seems you are doing at the present time, to leave the confines of my good constituency and go out to Portage la Prairie -- and while I have nothing against Portage la Prairie, I am sure my friend will agree that insofar as the aspect of close contact, particularly with the parents in Greater Winnipeg, they can have that better in St. Vital than they can in Portage la Prairie.

I realize again, Mr. Chairman, the position that my honourable friend the Minister of Health is in. I plead with him as the First Minister pleaded back in 1954 for these children, which incidentally, Mr. Chairman, is just 10 years ago. I am sure that if the Honourable Member for Wolseley was on this side of the House he would be standing up and pleading as I am pleading tonight for a continuing fair deal for the unfortunate children and their unfortunate parents, those connected with the St. Amant Ward in St. Boniface.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I would just say at this time that I respect the opinions that have been expressed by the honourable member and that I have had one of these parents in my office, giving much similar plea that the honourable member gave, quite recently -- as a matter of fact, just since this House has been in session -- and that the problem has certainly not gone unnoticed, and I think I can say that I feel the problem and that it will not be forgotten.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, in the Manitoba Budget and Economic Review 1964, page 13, there's rather an alarming statement there. It says that the number of hospitalized patients has increased -- they are talking about mental patients, Mr. Chairman -- has increased by over 20 percent each year since 1958, I think Mr. Chairman, that that needs a little bit of clarification. Now I am not a mathematician but if this figure remained at 20 percent each year, I wonder if there is anyone here who can tell us how long it would be before everybody in the Province of Manitoba would be in a mental institution. Every year -- if you kept up this it wouldn't be very long. It wouldn't be very long.

Now on Saturday morning when I took the bus out home, I had a very pleasant experience in that when the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and myself climbed on the bus -- we left our car here because we were more or less forced to on account of the weather -- but a very bright looking young fellow with no hat on, climbed in with the two of us in the back seat and I asked him where he was going and he said to Gladstone, and I said, "well you don't live in Gladstone do you?" "No", he said, "I just landed in Canada last evening from England, in that snowstorm." He said, "I had lunch yesterday in England and I'm having lunch today in Gladstone." We talked for some time and I said, "I sure would like to have your name before we

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) part company. " He was a very friendly fellow, he wrote his name down here; he's a physician and surgeon by the name of Dr. John Skinner -- and a very bright fellow -- and he told me that in England 49 percent of all the people that enter hospitals today have a mental condition of one kind or another and it's very alarming he says and it's increasing annually. Yes, they have the same type of administration over there presently as they have here but I don't think there's any connection there.

Some may think that there would be a connection but and do you know what he told me Mr. Chairman -- I said well the Honourable the First Minister, the other night made a statement something like this -- and I don't know whether I can quote him exactly -- but we were dealing with the Attorney-General's estimates, and he said, I think, something like this: "The general atmosphere of the society and the community for the number of people in our correctional institutions -- I believe this was it -- is a direct reflection of the atmosphere of our community and our society." And this is true, I believe that is true.

Here's another one: I think he was commenting on the fact that while the population in Manitoba had only increased by less than 20 percent in the last ten years, the number of people in our correctional institutions had doubled. I think that that is about the figures. Here again you have -- it's reported in the budget that there are 20 percent more people going through the mental institutions, they're patients of the mental institutions. Now this combination, the doubling of the people in the correctional institutions and an annual increase of 20 percent in the mental institutions, if that is a reflection of the atmosphere of our society and community, well then the atmosphere isn't very good I don't think.

This Dr. Skinner from England says it's bad over there and here's why he says it's bad, here is a contributing factor in his estimation -- and I don't know what his politics are -- but he says that the entire world generally are becoming more socialistic -- and I guess that is common knowledge -- and with that, just everyone loses a certain amount of responsibility. That is, people today are not prepared to look after their parents like they used to, even five or six years ago, and so on, and so on. Eventually there will be no responsibility at all. People are not able to adjust themselves to the various adjustments that are necessary in life if you are going to remain out of mental institutions, and this has brought it all about, according to him.

Now I think Mr. Chairman that I would like to have an explanation from the present Minister of Health, and the last one too, if he wishes to comment, on this atmosphere of the society and the community if it is a fact that we have twice as many people in our correctional institutions; twice as many people in the mental institutions -- probably not staying as long. It says here, they are not staying as long, but there are far more people going in them. What's the reason for all this? I think it's alarming.

. continued next page

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment if I may on what the last speaker has said, because what he says about the increased admission rate and discharge rate with respect to mental illness is not, for one thing, anything that any one of us should be talking about in any other way other than we would talk about any other physical illness. Mental illness is, of course, a tragedy and a very serious matter in our present-day society. But I would point out to the Honourable Member from Neepawa that for many years, many many people have lived with their neurosis and their psychosis in the community in this province where patients are not now in attendance at the community mental health clinics; where family physicians in general are referring more than they ever did before. I happen to know. I happen to know that the only way I could get help when I was in the country was to 'phone the mental hospital, call the police and send my patient down, and I didn't graduate that long ago. I also remember in my time the only way we had to sedate the patient was in ice in a bathtub in a very manic patient -- a thing which almost sounds as though it was in the middle ages today, and that's only 15 years ago. These are the striking advances that have been made in mental health, and the fact that you have now these modern drugs which make the treatment of acute illness so much easier and more sophisticated; leads to a quicker balance of the patient and a quicker discharge means a bigger turnover. The better service you give, and the more service you give, the more it is demanded of you, and the more it is demanded of your staff, and so on. And it's just like anything else with agreps or any other activity in government, when you develop a good service and you are really giving a service to the public, the demand is greater and they use a good service to the maximum.

The Honourable Member has referred to this being maybe we are getting more socialistic. I wouldn't say it's more socialistic. If it's socialistic well then it's good, if this is the case. But the very question that the Honourable Member from Neepawa has asked, is a question I asked many times as I talked to the psychiatrists, the provincial psychiatrist, who said, frankly one day he said, "Really they seem to just come out of the walls. I don't know where they all come from." But it is just as striking to the people in the field as it is to members of the House. I think that we should approach this in the most serious manner, rejoicing that there is this help for the people who have had these problems in the past. We hear from day to day that it's the rapid age in which we live, and so on, and no doubt this has something to do with it, but I think every one of us in this House can remember going through a community where there was the boy in town who never went to school; who walked around the streets. We all know of the recluses who shackled up and who became the so-called oddballs in the community. These are being ferreted out. People today send these -- there is help; there are community mental health clinics; there is hope, and hope is eternal in the human heart. This is what is happening, and this revolution has occurred since many of the members have sat in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, what my honourable friend has said then in effect is, that there are not any more crazy people like me around than there was twenty years ago, only they are just coming forward and being treated now I guess. But he didn't answer my question, and probably he's not in a position to. Probably tomorrow someone will be able to tell us that if there is an annual increase of 20 percent each year, at what point then would you reach, say a million people -- we have a million in Manitoba. It wouldn't take very long, it wouldn't take very long if there was 20 percent annually before you would have a million mentally defective people in Manitoba. Probably he can get that answer for me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering on this whole field of psychiatric treatment, are we doing what we should be doing in schools and in adult education in this particular field, because I maintain that it is necessary for just everyone in order to be a sound individual, to make certain adjustments in his lifetime. Some people say that every normal person has four periods of adjustment -- high, low, intermediate and super high or something. But that being so, with automation in all the fields, and in years to come probably my honourable friend will not live to see the day -- I don't know whether I will -- but we are going to reach the day, sooner or later, when people will be working a 20 hour week, maybe less than that, let's face it -- just everyone will have more hours to do what? --(Interjection) -- That's what I'm on. That's exactly what I'm talking about. We will have a lot of people with a lot of free hours and -- (Interjection) -- you bet your life -- my honourable friend from Selkirk says to go nuts -- and these are the type

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd) . . . of things that we have to be looking at now if we're going to keep this figure down, is to have an educational system that will teach we people how to make the necessary adjustments over the years.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions I'd like to have the Minister answer. I wonder if he could define or give us a breakdown on Item 5 where we have 450 -- (Interjection) -- Yes but we went so fast on it that I couldn't get the information. This is being paid by the federal government but I'd still like to have the Minister inform us as to what this money is going for. And also under 6 (c) Maintenance of Mental Defectives Outside Provincial Institutions. We are spending \$500,000 on this item. Where does this money go to and just for what exact purposes?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll just go back briefly to the item under Mental Health Grants. It's going for research. It goes towards the aid in drugs; aid in providing psychiatric services, and a whole flock of different activities in the psychiatric field, but basically it's for research and basically in assistance with such matters as drugs and in grants to further education for psychiatric staff.

I would like to say to the Honourable Member for Neepawa that I have asked this question about how many have we got, and I understand that in Manitoba the incidence of mental diseases is no greater than anywhere else. It is not necessarily increasing over the years but as we provide more community mental health centres -- and we are providing two more this year -- as people get to know of the new treatments that are available, drugs and therapies that can be used now with the work of the Canadian Mental Health Association, that more people are coming for the treatment which is now provided -- we are able to provide it -- and more people are going back into the community. So while the numbers are increasing, they are not increasing in any excessive amount to any other area in relation to the increase in the population.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (6) passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before (6) passes -- I'm prepared to allow (6) to pass providing the Minister will give me an answer, possibly tomorrow, to one question dealing with (6) -- and that is the reduction from \$57,000 to \$35,000 in respect of the grant to the Child Guidance Clinic. Now I'm not asking my honourable friend to answer me tonight. I'd be perfectly happy to allow No. (6) on the provision that he gives me the information at the commencement of tomorrow's committee meeting. It's 11 o'clock and we can't break the rules.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the reason it's down is because we are receiving more money from the federal government toward this Child Guidance Clinic. Apparently we make up the difference in the cost of staff in the Child Guidance Clinic between what grants are received from the federal government and what is left over. And we got more money than we anticipated.

MR. PAULLEY: give me those figures in writing, the amount from the federal government and the likes of this, I move the committee rise and report.

MR. ROBLIN: him that I'm happy to accept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution and 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.

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.