

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 12th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Francis Alexander Lavens Mathewson and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Planetarium.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are seven Grade 7 and 8 students from Clearspring School under the direction of Mr. Bartel. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. There are some 15 Grade 11 students under the direction of Sister Augustine from Sacred Heart School. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Logan. There are 32 Grade 5 and 6 students from Montrose School under the direction of Miss Penner. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to give a brief report to the Assembly with respect to predicted peaks on the Red and Assiniboine. Due to the very rapid melting of the snow combined with rains, we have some local flooding at various spots in Manitoba and a revision has been made in the peak forecasted on the Red River. There is no revision in respect to the Assiniboine because in the great part of the watershed of the Assiniboine the precipitation was relatively light, but they did experience about an inch and a quarter rainfall in North Dakota and Minnesota in the headwaters of the Red River.

Since the last flood forecast revision on April 6, 1965, there has been above-normal rainfall over the Red River watershed, particularly south of the boundary over the week-end. The rainfall at Fargo was 1.41 inches and at Grand Forks 1.38 inches. The average for the Red River basin above Winnipeg was about one and a quarter inches. As a result of this rainfall, the United States authorities have raised the forecast for Fargo from 7,000 cubic feet per second to 13,000 cubic feet per second to occur April 13th and 14th. At Grand Forks, the forecast is raised to 35,000 cubic feet per second for April 18th. The revised forecast for Manitoba is as follows: Emerson, 35,000 cfs on April 22nd; Morris, 37,000 cfs on April 23rd; Winnipeg, 59,000 cfs on April 25th, and 59,000 cubic feet per second at Winnipeg is stage 19 city datum, which is one foot above first flood stage. This would indicate very little flooding outside of the river channel proper and will certainly be contained within the primary dikes which have a capacity of about 80,000 cubic feet per second and with a top height of 26.5 feet above city datum.

On the Assiniboine River, the recent rainfall was relatively light west of Portage and therefore there is no change in the previously predicted flows of 7,900 cubic feet per second at Brandon and 9,100 cubic feet at Portage. However, ice jams are unpredictable and could cause local trouble. In all cases, favourable weather during the next two weeks, particularly over the Red River watershed, could allow for considerable spreading out of the peak flows now predicted for Fargo and Grand Forks before they reach Manitoba, and thus the Emerson and Winnipeg peaks could be reduced. On the other hand, above-normal precipitation coinciding with the downstream movement of the peak flows could further aggravate the above prediction. The above forecast revisions are prepared by the Flood Control and Conservation staff and have not been considered in detail by the Flood Forecasting Committee, but the committee members have been advised.

The channel capacity at Emerson is about 38,000 cubic feet per second and at Morris about 40,000 cubic feet per second. Flows above these figures will gradually creep out of the normal channels. Since the forecast at each point are approaching these channel capacities, we have telephoned this information to the municipal offices at Emerson and Morris and will be confirming the forecast information by letter. That is the report that I have to give to the Assembly at this time.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, may I, on the basis of the report that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture just

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd), gave us, ask him if stand-by units are being prepared or re-organized in the event of continued adverse weather conditions.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, instructions were given to the staff of my department to make sure that the procedures under the Emergency Measures Organization were ready to go if there are any threatening developments in the province.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader insofar as legislation matters are concerned. Some weeks ago I put in Order for Return dealing with the question of Brown Steel Tank in Brandon. I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General could indicate when I might have Returns.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): I think within the next two or three days.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following bills standing in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

Bill Nos. 4, 49, 51 and 92 were read section by section and passed.

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

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Nos. 4, 49, 51 and 92 and has adopted all of these bills without amendment.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

Bill Nos. 4, 49, 51 and 92 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 68. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, Bill 68 is in respecting Highways and the Highways Department -- establishing a separate Highways Department. I have no quarrel with the bill as such in proposing a separate Highways Branch or Department. However, there are a few things that I think I would like to comment on, and I don't want to be too repetitious as to what other honourable members have already stated in the House in connection with this bill.

However, I find in connection with the powers of the Minister and also the delegation of powers as set out in Section 5 and then referred to in Section 23 (1), it seems to me that the Minister has the power of delegation but then later on does not necessarily have to accept responsibility for the actions that have been taken by the person so delegated to. I would like to have the Minister responsible for the bill to probably refer to this matter. Also, is this consistent with the powers of other Ministers or are we giving special powers to the Highways Minister in this respect.

There are other matters I would like to touch on. One has to do with Section 15. I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, that I have to refer to certain sections because.

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member in speaking on second reading will have to refer to the principles in an abstract manner rather than section by section.

MR. FROESE: Well I'll try and do that, Madam Speaker. I know other members have referred to sections but I will try and refrain from doing so.

There's a particular section in the bill referring to the 125 foot rule that you cannot have buildings closer to the highway than 125 feet, and I think this places a hardship many a time. I know of one particular case where a widow has a valuable property next to town and the highway department, or the Department of Public Works as it now is still constituted, expropriated

(MR. FROESE cont'd)..... a certain number of feet of that property for highway purposes. As a result, the strip of land is now too narrow to put on buildings and as a result the property is devalued at least three or five times. Probably the value before was \$1,000 and is now devalued to just common agricultural land which would be in the neighbourhood of \$200.00. This matter still isn't settled. It's still in abeyance, left in abeyance. These are some of the hardships created by a hard and fast rule in the Act and I would prefer giving the Minister some leeway and discretion in this matter rather than to set down a hard and fast rule.

Then also in another part of the bill that is being proposed, the Minister can or may designate that certain highways is a provincial highway -- a proposed highway I mean -- and they may never act on this. There's no time limit set in which they have to act and this could be indefinite for three, five, ten years, who knows. Yet this 125 foot matter would apply and therefore these people could not use that property for that purpose when they really should have that prerogative.

I also note that the bill contains a clause in connection with the abandonment of provincial highways. Here again the government has taken over municipal roads as provincial roads now, and some of these roads were kept in very good shape. What guarantee have we now that they will be kept up-to-date and will be kept in good order. Probably they will deteriorate and within a couple of years they might be abandoned. This is one thing that causes concern. I would like to have some assurance from the Minister that these things will not just happen, because now after having taken them over the 40-60 percent arrangement will not apply, and then if they're abandoned that means that the municipality has to take them over again and probably spend a lot of money in putting them back into shape.

The bill also refers to certain standards. Has the government set out classification of standards, or what is the situation. I notice one clause of the bill that refers to the "municipality shall properly maintain" and in another part of the bill it's left up to the discretion of the Minister, but it seems to me that there should be some classifications set out that the Minister can instruct the municipalities to spend certain monies or bring the roads up to certain standards, that there should be some classification as to what kind of standards.

I think the matter of the sale of materials has already been commented on by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and I hope the Minister answers those queries so I won't have to dwell on that, except to say that in my opinion it seems that the Minister has power to expropriate and then later on could dispose of those properties, sell them to whoever he pleases. It seems to me that here again we should have some concern if certain expropriations take place, that those people that lose those properties would later on, if they were for sale, have a first priority in bidding on them.

In the past I have asked for a list of the roads taken over by the government or a map showing these roads. I wonder if we could have a list of these roads taken over. I have made this request several times. I made it at the fall session last August, I think twice, and I have already asked for them at this session. Could we not have a list given to us as members? I know the municipalities have received information. Why is this information not made available to us? I for one would appreciate getting it. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak on Bill 68, I think that I'd like to just make a few remarks. I don't think that I will attempt at this stage of the game to answer all of the questions that were asked concerning all of the various sections of the bill. I'll be quite happy to do this at committee stage.

There were some questions on drafting and what not which were raised by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, and he did pick out at least one mistake in one section of the bill and the Legislative Counsel will have amendments at the Law Amendments Committee to correct the error that was made in printing there.

There are many sections in which some of the honourable members said that they felt they couldn't go along with as far as discretionary powers and so on and so forth were concerned, and really and truly all of the sections, Madam Speaker, that the honourable members have referred to in this line are straight lifts from the Department of Public Works Act as it exists at the present time. The delegation of powers are there. I am a firm believer that as far as delegation of powers is concerned, while I have been Minister they have been reasonable. I have no reason to believe that they have been any different during the reign of office of any of the other Ministers that have taken part at this stage of the game. I think that this is one of

(MR. WEIR cont'd). those things that does enable the massive amount of work and little bits and pieces of contracts and what not that have to be entered into to be done with reasonable despatch.

The question of metropolitan grants for both construction and maintenance was referred to along with the other sections referring to grants for cities, towns, villages, etcetera outside of the metropolitan area. The fact that the Metro area maintenance as well as construction was included, where in the other areas construction only was included, reflects the new policy of the government as far as assistance within these communities is concerned.

In any of the communities outside of the metropolitan area, the roads and streets that are declared provincial roads will have the full cost of construction and maintenance of the road paid for by the Province of Manitoba. One hundred percent of the maintenance will be provided within the communities on the provincial roads and provincial trunk highways. In the metropolitan area, all of the streets are metropolitan streets that qualify for provincial assistance. The Province of Manitoba will not have any trunk highways or provincial roads within the metropolitan area on a declared basis. They will all be metropolitan streets which will provide for, we hope, a better opportunity for administering the regulations through one body rather than doing it through two bodies for all of the various permits, etc., that are required by the people. The policy of the government is that there will be a 50-50 contribution on construction and a maintenance grant of \$1,000 per lane mile of metropolitan streets.

These are items that I'll be happy, Madam Speaker, to discuss further at estimate time, but in the towns, villages and cities outside of Metro there are other streets, and while the formula isn't in the Act now and has not been in the Act in the past, it is government policy that there are streets within these other urban communities that do have an inter-municipal flavour and that there is complete justification for the Province of Manitoba to make a contribution towards these streets. The type of streets that are being contemplated under this are access to schools and hospitals, elevators, and things of this nature where there is a distinct inter-municipal flavour. It replaces the former policy of 60 percent of this same type of -- well about the same type of street that was qualified before. Last fall I visited with most of the towns, the town councils in rural Manitoba and the city councils and explained the policy to them and discussed with them the streets that should qualify on this basis, and the understanding is there that as other streets qualify for provincial assistance that this can be done at that time.

There has been considerable discussion as far as the 125 foot distance being required for permits for structures. The fact that this is a hardship on the individual that owns the land, and I recognize as well as anybody else does that we don't like regulations that make it difficult for people to own land or do with it as they see fit, but there is an area where the public interest is involved, and in this area on roads and streets that are liable to have to be widened at some date in the future, the only time that this reservation can logically be looked after is at a time before too much development takes place.

I think that the honourable members will all recognize that this 125 foot refers to all of the provincial roads and provincial trunk highways that are not under the control of the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board, and those roads and highways that are under the control of the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board, there is a greater distance limitation than this. Quite frankly, some of the areas on highways, if the area of control had been a little larger it would have been a little easier to expand the road system as we have to at this stage of Manitoba's development. We are convinced that Manitoba is going to grow and it's going to be quite necessary as time goes on to expand the road system.

There have been other comments made, Madam Speaker, in connection with the trade-in not being a sale, and the obvious reason there is that if something is traded in on something of a greater value, the interest that the government had in the assets that they traded in still show up in the new piece of equipment or whatever the case may be and the asset is not disposed of, it rests in the new piece of equipment.

The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains indicated that within the Act it would appear to him to be possible for the Minister to enter into a contract the size of the Floodway without calling tenders or anything else -- just go out and buy enough equipment. He appears to have neglected the areas in the bill which indicate that it is the duty of the Minister to call tenders for any project unless there is some specific reason why this is not in the interests of the people of Manitoba.

I think that on a clause by clause study of the bill, Madam Speaker, that these points can

(MR. WEIR cont'd). be cleared up to everybody's satisfaction and that he will find there is no real expansion of discretionary powers within the Act. There have been other things referred to like lights and so on and so forth which I think again could more properly be discussed under my estimates when we arrive at that stage of the game.

The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains enquired as to the annual reports and there will be no indication -- the Branch will still anticipate providing copies to the members as early as they can possibly be made available, but this doesn't get around the fact that once the House is in session there needs to be a copy of the annual report placed on the table for the records of the House.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland and some of the other members spoke about the abandonment of roads and the powers of the Minister. Without looking at the bill, I believe that the abandonment of the roads can be done by regulation, not by the Minister. Roads would be able to be closed by the Minister once they are no longer needed for traffic, but as far as abandonment is concerned from a provincial road or a provincial trunk highway to a municipal authority, it would be required by regulation.

As far as allowing the disintegration of the roads that have been taken over, nothing could be further from the minds of the members of the department or of the government to allow this to happen. In anything as all-embrasive as this is in the government of Manitoba, amendments are going to be necessary from time to time, with the consent of the municipalities I think in most cases, to change locations and increase the mileage and maybe even in some cases decrease the mileage or amend it in various ways because the demands that are created through the road system over a period of time change as the province moves along.

The honourable member spoke about a map and an indication of the roads. The map is being prepared and will be distributed to the honourable members before very long.

I think, Madam Speaker, that covers the majority of the points. Any that I have missed I'll be happy to discuss individually at committee stage.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 101. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, on reading Bill 101 and analyzing it in comparison to what has gone on in the past in the Province of Manitoba, I find that I cannot support the proposition of the Minister in this particular instance.

It seems to me that if I read the Act correctly this will do away completely with the sharing by the Province of Manitoba in the cost of predator control through the municipalities. From now on, municipalities who want to continue with the bounty system will have to provide all of the bounty money themselves. The government abandons this manner of predator control in the Province of Manitoba. The alternative to this I presume then must be a more extensive effort on the part of the government itself through the use of hunters. Now this technique has been used in Manitoba for some years.

The Minister said in introducing the bill that the bounty system had not worked and he gave as an example the fact that every year we are paying out money for bounties and we still had predators. Well this is very true. I think you have to look at the matter though from the other standpoint, that if the bounty had not been paid we would have had a lot more predators, because at least the bounty system did do away every year, and it's reported annually by the Minister of Agriculture, with a fairly large number of predators. By the same token, the Minister should have said that the hunter system has not been fully effective because we have had the hunter system in Manitoba for many years and we still have predators. Is it a conclusion therefore that we can draw that the bounty system does not work and that the hunter system does work?

It seems to me that what the Minister is doing is centralizing in the hands of the government this whole matter of predator control rather than having it decentralized down in the local area where the predators are and having the municipalities co-operate in the program. I don't think that the Minister has made a case to prove that this is in fact the proper system. In fact I'm surprised on reading the report of the department that while we have conducted many varied type of studies, the report each year under the heading of "Research and Management" lists a very large number of studies conducted by the department. There are wildlife survey projects on big game, on water fowl, on upland game birds, and on fur-bearing animals; wildlife research projects on caribou, white-tailed deer, woodland caribou,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) waterfowl; and there are special habitat projects on game management, on special areas such as the Souris River watershed and on and on. The department does carry on a very extensive research, but I find nowhere in here where any research has been conducted on the matter of predators.

This is a very important matter not simply from the agricultural standpoint but as well from the wildlife aspect of it. The Province of Manitoba from a monetary standpoint gets a substantial advantage from wildlife in this province. To the government directly in the form of revenue, it brings in something in the order of a half a million dollars annually, and it's also a very important aspect in tourist industry. It certainly provides in many areas of the province a good deal of additional income. Similarly, the welfare I think of our people all told and the fact that there is this recreation available to them is an extremely important aspect to which you can not add a specific monetary value.

So for the Minister to say we are going to abandon this method of predator control; we are not going to have that any longer; I think is a reverse step. I don't think that we are going at it in the way that we should. As it was, it seemed to me that The Predator Act should have been expanded rather than restricted. It covers only certain animals and as my colleagues have pointed out there are others, notably the skunk, which has become a serious matter in many areas particularly for wildlife, less so for agriculture but certainly very important in the case of wildlife, and yet no study has been conducted in this particular field. The very fact that the trapping of skunks is no longer a paying operation has meant that their numbers have increased.

This then has to be offset in some manner. We go along and we increase the availability of hunting privileges, which is excellent, and the fact that new areas are opened up all the time means that more and more people can get out and more of the areas of the province are subject to hunting pressure. Well we can't go along on the one side and have a very important predator, that is man himself as a hunter, proceed to kill off the desirable species of wildlife and not at the same time do something very positive to counterbalance this, to cut down the predators themselves, because if we carry on in this way quite obviously the balance gets further and further out and I don't think that this control can be done by a centralized hunter operation under the government itself. I don't think that you can do it by simply sending out from the Department of Mines and Natural Resources people to go out and shoot or trap coyotes and foxes and skunks. I think that it would be much more effectively done at the municipal level by the people living in the area, by people who are there and the government participating with it. This to me is a means of having the co-operation of a large number of people in this very important control field.

So, Madam Speaker, to go ahead on this basis I think is an error. I don't think it is based on any research program, or at least there's none indicated in my honourable friend's department and I don't recall in his speech that he said that there was, I think that this is just an attempt to try something different and there's no indication that it will work. There's certainly proof that the bounty system did do away with a lot of predators.

There is one further point, Madam Speaker. The government speaks frequently about increased aid to municipalities. Well here is a specific case where we are withdrawing aid for municipalities because in the past we have co-operated with them by providing 50 per cent of the bounty costs. Now this will be eliminated and if they want to have a predator control program -- and we have to admit that the need varies. You are not going to have the same problem in every municipality in the province, notably those municipalities that are alongside the wilderness areas or along the local government districts have a very different problem from the settled municipalities in the centre of the province, and to say that none of them are going to get anything is certainly throwing the balance off.

But in the total analysis, the municipalities of this province last year, for example, the total grant insofar as the Department of Agriculture was concerned was over \$30,000.00. The government is now abandoning this program. A number of the municipalities will not be able to abandon the program because of their special provisions in those areas, because of their own special problems. People for example like my colleague the Member for Ethelbert Plains along the Duck Mountains, or the Member for Swan River, which is one area that has had a particular predator problem, these people I don't think can abandon this and yet the government will leave them strictly on their own. So this is another step in reverse, Madam Speaker. Instead of being aid to municipalities, this is cutting off aid to municipalities.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I just say a word in connection with Bill 101. The debate has been most interesting, and while we in this group recognize that there appears

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) to be a different approach insofar as predator control is concerned and also the payment of bounties as has been the practice for awhile, I think that as far as that part is concerned that the bill should go to committee to give those who may be adversely affected on the municipal end at least an opportunity to make their views known to the committee. I'm not sure, Madam Speaker, whether in one section of the bill there isn't the possibility of the municipalities to recoup at least 50 percent of the cost of the bounties. I'd like this clarified because I've heard the opposite suggestion in one or two of the debates. It does, in my reading of the bill, appear that this is still a possibility.

I can well recall this matter of bounties and predators as being a subject of much debate in this House ever since I had the honour of being here. I only need to remember or call to the attention of those who had the pleasure of being in the House when a former member from Swan River, the late George Renouf, was a member in the House, Madam Speaker, and every time we came to the question of predators the other members of the House started making wolf calls, so this has been a problem as far as this Assembly is concerned for a good number of years.

But I do think, Madam Speaker, in all deference to the points raised by some members in this House that the bill should go to committee where representations can be heard respecting the different sections we have before us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I'll close the debate on the second reading of this bill.

First of all I should like to say that the policy that is represented in this bill has been considered by the Wildlife Branch for some considerable time, and they I think would be the first to say that they would like to try this approach in Manitoba to see how successful it is going to be. If it doesn't meet with the kind of success that they feel it will meet with, then of course changes could be made. After the experience of say a year or two, changes could be made, some perhaps even along the lines of some of the speeches that have been made by some honourable members opposite. If for instance it is found necessary on a regionalized basis, say particularly in local government districts, after experience to reinstitute a partial bounty system, that could be done. I'm not saying it will be done but I say it could be done in the light of experience after we have the new Act in operation.

Their present feeling, however, and this is the feeling of people who are much more qualified to speak on this than certainly I am, their present feeling is that this will not be the experience that we will have, that quite the converse will be the case; namely, that we will find as they have found in Saskatchewan and as they have found in most of the other provinces where bounties have already been abolished, as they have found in most of the states of the United States where bounties have already been abolished, that Manitoba will not find the need to revert to the bounty system. I say, however, that if the experience is not in accordance with their prognostications that we can look at this matter again.

I might say, however, that this debate, like so many other debates I suppose on predator control over the years, has been notable for the fact that it sheds perhaps more heat than light on the subject. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has just taken his seat with the ringing -- I won't say denunciation -- but the ringing challenge to the department, why haven't you had a study on this? Well I should say to him for his own benefit that studies have been made on predator control by the major U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, by most of the major services having regard to predators on the North American continent, and the policy that is reflected in this Act is not the policy of a parochial study that took place in Manitoba but it is the policy that is reflected by national studies that have taken place on this continent.

If he wants any -- if he would like any support for that statement I merely refer him to a man who is certainly not unknown to this province, a man not unknown to the wildlife problem in North America, and I refer to Dr. Ira M. Gabrielson, who was for very many years the Director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This is a quotation from a speech that Dr. Gabrielson made on the question of bounties. "I believe that bounties are entirely a waste of money. If predator control needs to be done, it should be done by a more direct method and applied to the places where needed rather than with the broadcast application that always comes with the bounty system."

Now that is only one of what I suggest could be a host of opinions that would come from the leading experts on predator control on the North American continent about bounties. I think

(MR. LYON cont'd). most of us read in the week-end supplement of the Winnipeg Tribune, I think it was some four weeks ago, why bounties should be discontinued. This was an article that was written having regard mostly I think to experience in the United States and I would commend it to honourable members of the House who wish to have a more general view on this subject. So I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to those who have spoken on this matter, that the opinion respecting the ineffectiveness of bounties is certainly not just a branch opinion, it's an opinion that's held right across the country, right across the whole continent by those people who have expert knowledge in the field.

Now I hasten to say to the Member for Lakeside that I'm something like him because I know that experts aren't always right any more than politicians are always right, but I think they're a little closer to being right on this subject than perhaps the politicians are, and certainly I think that what they recommend to us, not just on a provincial basis but certainly on a continent-wide basis, deserves a fair try in our province.

Another point that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition is the alternative program, which is really not an alternative program but rather an enhancement of existing programs that will largely take the place of bounty payments. The alternative program is a multi-facetous program, that is it is a program that involves poison bait, that involves hunting, that involves trapping, and that involves really a pinpointing of departmental activity on a regionalized basis under the direction of the field officers of the department to meet specific problems as they arrive in a specific area. Honourable members will realize that the bounty payment principle is completely indiscriminate. Now if you have an outbreak for instance of coyote problems in the northwest corner of the province, the bounty principle does you absolutely no good if coyotes are taken in the southeast corner and payments are made down there, because your problem is not in the southeast corner, it's in the localized area of the northwest part of the province, to use a hypothetical case, and so the bounty system is completely hypothetical.

The honourable members talk about the difficulty with municipalities. The municipalities I remind them again are the ones who are by and large in favour of the abolition of the bounty program because as I mentioned -- and I repeat it -- as I mentioned at the outset when I was introducing this bill, the general principles of the bill were discussed with the Executive of the Union of Municipalities and they passed a resolution favouring this approach, favouring this approach to predator control in Manitoba, because they being on the ground and having the administration in many cases of this bounty principle in Manitoba, they realized that the bounty principle just doesn't work. How many cases do we know, each one of us in this Assembly, of municipalities being required to pay 50 percent of a bounty of a particular predator when everyone concerned practically knew darn well that that predator wasn't taken in that municipality. This is the kind of abuse that arises from this indiscriminate form of bounty payment. That is not to say that possibly if it could be properly implemented that it might not have some use, but implemented on the basis that it has been in the past, by and large, it has proven to be a weak weapon in the control of predators.

There has been considerable concern expressed about skunks. The passage of this Act will not change the situation vis-a-vis skunks one bit. Skunks never have been predators under The Predator Control Act, notwithstanding the impassioned speeches made by the Member for St. George and perhaps one or two other members opposite. The new bill will not change the position vis-a-vis skunks whatsoever. There never has been a bounty on skunks. Skunks under the new Act will be nuisance animals and there is absolutely no change in the position vis-a-vis skunks at all.

There were some other points that were mentioned that reference should be made to. I'm surprised to hear some of the comments, particularly from some of our friends from the Liberal Party because I think it was -- 1956 was it -- that they abandoned bounty payments on wolves after the 10-80 or the poisoned bait program had proven to be so effective. This is an example of how the application of new principles on the poisoned bait and so on has changed the attitude of governments over the years towards the traditional and, may I say, the old-fashioned bounty payment system. Somebody shook their head, so I shall take a look at a piece of paper here to indicate when the bounty was ceased on wolves. The timber wolf bounty was discontinued in 1956 in the time of the administration of the Honourable Member for Lakeside because the poisoned bait program had proven to be so effective with respect to them that it was not necessary to continue it at that time.

Now a question was raised earlier in the debate about whether or not -- I believe by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains -- whether or not municipalities would be declared

(MR. LYON cont'd).....Predator Control Areas. I can tell him that it is the intention that a regulation be passed creating all municipalities and LGDs, that is Local Government Districts, predator control areas. This will enable any municipality to pass bylaws with respect to bounty if they so desire.

To go back to skunks just for a moment, the municipal programs in skunk eradication towards which The Wildlife Branch and the Department of Agriculture have contributed technical advice and assistance in organization have been largely effective in controlling skunks and have been applied particularly where rabies has been feared. The point is raised certainly by the Wildlife people that a bounty on skunks, which has been advocated from time to time I know, but a bounty on skunks could be a potentially dangerous thing because it could encourage particularly youngsters to go out and to handle possibly rabid animals without benefitting the control program and certainly with considerable danger to themselves. I know this is only one aspect of the question but certainly they are not recommending any bounty on skunks at the present time.

I reject out of hand the suggestion that the Act before the House at the present time is retrogressive. It is not retrogressive, rather it is in keeping with the changing trend towards predator control right across the North American continent, and it provides in effect that money that was previously handed out on rather an indiscriminate basis may be better spent on control programs pinpointed to areas where they are needed rather than handed out as I say on an indiscriminate basis. Bounties are indiscriminate and they do not lead to the pinpointing of resources to areas where they are needed.

The new Act can be said to represent something better than the department merely sitting around and doling out money from the public purse for the indiscriminate killing of animals. Some of these animals of course must be kept. We know that not all animals are predators, not all foxes are predators, not all skunks are predators, not all wolves necessarily are predators. They only become predators when they start to prey upon other animals or other stock that is part of the balance of nature or other stock that is raised by humans, and we know that not all of them must be killed off. Unfortunately under the bounty system, every animal whether he's a predator or not, whether he is preying on other animals or not, is subject to be killed. In the control programs that are recommended in this Act, of course that will not be the case.

Now I don't think there are any other questions that were raised that I haven't dealt with in passing. I think that covers most of the points. I do commend the Act to the House. I suggest that we would like to have a year or two years' experience in the operation of the Act. We feel that it will be as successful as the people in the Wildlife Branch tell us, prognosticate on its success. We feel that the experience gained in other jurisdictions, not only in Canada but in the United States, means that this is progressive rather than retrogressive legislation, and we ask the House to support this new approach to predator control in Manitoba.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister two questions. First, I'd be interested if he would tell me how you tell that either a coyote or a timber wolf, how you tell one that's a predator from one that isn't. Secondly, I would like to ask him, is it not a fact that when the bounty on timber wolves was done away with that was mainly because of the fact that our two neighboring provinces, both Ontario and Saskatchewan, had discontinued their bounty system on timber wolves?

MR. LYON: My honourable friend asks a question that he can answer much better than I. We all know, however, that you get complaints from different areas of the province as to whether or not predators are causing a problem. If predators are in a certain area and they're not causing a problem, you won't hear about them, so why should they be shot there? On the other hand, if you have complaints as we have had in other recent years, from the ones with pasture as an example, about predators working in that area, then you know darn well that any coyote or timber wolf or whatever in that area is a potential predator and you go out and you kill him. So that's the very simple answer to that question.

No. 2. Again I suggest the honourable member can answer the question much better than I, because he participated in the decision; I didn't. All I know is that they were discontinued in 1956 and if that was a good analogy at that time I would suggest that Saskatchewan now, our neighboring province having discontinued the bounty system some years ago, Manitoba might just as well catch up progressively with that province in that field.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, my question was, was it not a fact that that is why it was done away with, because my honourable friend gave another reason for it being done away with.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister another question. He referred to Doctor Ira Gabrielson. Last year I had asked some questions about the report of Dr. Gabrielson and had asked for a copy of it. My honourable friend at that time was not prepared to give us copies. I wonder if he would be prepared now to give members in the House copies of Dr. Gabrielson's report.

MR. LYON: The quotation that I gave you from Dr. Gabrielson was not from any report that he gave to the Province of Manitoba. This was from a paper that he delivered I believe in Washington, D. C.

MR. MOLGAT: He did make a report

MR. LYON: . . . for not giving Dr. Gabrielson's report applied because it was, it was inter-departmental report.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the second reading of Bill No. 101.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 40; Nays, 11.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 86. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague the Honourable Member from Selkirk.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, to say that I am disappointed in this bill is an understatement. I think the government had a wonderful opportunity here of doing something effective and something comprehensive in the field of consumer credit, but to me this bill is more noted for its omissions than for its inclusions, and I feel that if this bill is passed in its present form it will amount to a codification of confusion.

This bill, Madam, has basically two fundamental principles. One deals with the remedies of an unpaid vendor under a time sales agreement or a conditional sales contract; the other deals with what is known in the bill as an off-premises sale or a direct sale.

Now dealing with the first principle, that is the remedies of the unpaid vendor, at the present moment the unpaid vendor under a time sales agreement has the remedy of seizing, selling, suing for any deficiency. Under this particular bill he can only exercise these remedies in the alternative. In other words if he decides to seize and sell, whatever he gets for the goods would be in satisfaction of the balance owing to him under the conditional sales contract, and if there was any surplus that surplus would be paid over to the purchaser from whom the seizure was made. Then again he has the right, as an alternative but not conjunctively, he has the right rather than to make a seizure under his contract to sue on the covenant and recover a money judgment. Now if he does recover a money judgment under the bill then he seizes the goods, whatever he gets for these goods on a seizure would be in satisfaction of the judgment subject to paying over any surplus that may result from the sale.

Now the Act as it is drafted just now refers to a seizure of the goods, but it doesn't say what would happen if the vendor exercises the alternative of suing on the covenant then issue an execution against other goods, other than those that are covered in the original contract. Now what is the situation if that happened?

I think, Madam, that there's one thing that we should do and it's the first thing we should do in respect of consumer credit, and that is to get a statutory form of contract which will cover all conditional sales agreements. Now there is nothing novel in a statutory form of contract. We have that statutory form of contract in respect of farm implements, both large and small; we have that statutory form of contract in respect of fire insurance, life insurance, casualty insurance, hail insurance. There's nothing new in it and I think that the first thing that we must do in Manitoba is to enact a statutory form of contract which will clearly define and set out the obligations of an unpaid vendor and the rights of an unpaid seller.

Now this Act is completely silent on one thing which to me is very basic in respect of

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd). consumer credit, and that is to give the opportunity of a debtor to pay what is in arrears without the unpaid vendor having an unquestionable right to exercise the acceleration clause which is in all these contracts. Now if it's a mortgage of land and the mortgagor falls behind in his payments, before that mortgagee can exercise any power of sale he has to serve upon the mortgagor a notice of exercising power of sale, and under The Real Property Act as long as that mortgagor pays up the arrears under that mortgage then the sale proceedings stop.

Now under this particular time sales agreement there's nothing in this Act which gives to an unpaid vendor the right of paying up arrears and stopping the proceedings. As a matter of fact, I have found in my experience that a great number of these finance companies make these seizures for the purpose of forcing that purchaser to refinance a contract, and in a great number of instances the contract is refinanced with the same finance company with finance charges added on to what was owing before. Now I think that what I have said is basic to any form of consumer credit. We must give to the debtor the right to pay what is in arrears and stop the proceedings.

Another thing too, Madam, under our present law, giving to the unpaid vendor the right to take action immediately without serving any notice on the debtor places the debtor in the position, if he can't refinance that contract, of losing what he paid on it. Now I think in fairness to an honest debtor who has just got into temporary trouble, I think he should have that right of remedy in his defect, and I would suggest that whatever we do, we insist upon that becoming part and parcel of our law.

Now the second part of this Act, Madam, deals with what is loosely referred to as an off-premise sale, and quite frankly I don't like the -- there's no definition given in the Act of what an off-premise sale is. All we can imply from the Act is this, that the sections dealing with off-premise sales only apply in a case where goods are sold by a vendor or anyone on his behalf at a place other than on the premises where the vendor regularly carries on his business. In other words, if a country garage man or a country car dealer goes out into the country to take orders for the sale of cars, that contract could be cancelled two days after it was signed because it's an off-premise sale.

Now surely it was never intended that that should be the case here. I think that what we should try to regulate here is what is known as itinerant salesmen, people who go from house to house taking orders for goods or for services. I think these are the people that we are trying to regulate, and if these are the people we are trying to regulate, I submit that this Act is not sufficiently comprehensive nor does it give to a debtor the security that that debtor should have. Unless the government intends to bring in another Act dealing with this specific subject alone, I suggest that you should take a look at the present Act before the Saskatchewan Legislature where they have a bill dealing with direct sales which is very comprehensive. In order to protect anybody who buys from one of these individuals who goes from door to door, I think it's most essential that that individual not only be licensed but that individual be bonded, because what good is it to give to a person who buys something from a door to door salesman, and perhaps gives that door to door salesman something in trade, what good is it to give that person the right to cancel that contract within two days if that individual to whom the deal was made has flown the coop. I suggest that the first thing that we should do with these itinerant salesmen is put them under a provincial license and see that they are bonded.

Now it may appear that I am being inconsistent when I say that I am going to support this bill on second reading, but I am going to support it because I want to get this subject into committee. This is a very important subject and the only way that I can get it into committee is to support this bill, but I wish to assure all members of the House, Madam, that when it does come into committee that we on this side of the House are going to have a lot of amendments that we are going to suggest on this legislation.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 100.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 100, an Act to amend The Ground Water and Well Water Act, for second reading.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would be kind enough now to call the adjourned debate on the report of the Highway Safety and Traffic Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. ROBLIN: It looks to me as if he's flown the coop. Madam Speaker, I didn't notice he was absent when I made this suggestion. Perhaps the matter could be allowed to stand and we would then proceed to the -- well I was going to call the resolution on legal aid but I see the gentleman that adjourned that resolution, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, is missing, so then we'll proceed to the next resolution if you please that deals with the Constitution of Canada.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health,

Whereas on the 20th day of February, 1964, this House did concur in the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders respecting the draft of an Act known as The Constitution of Canada Amendment Act;

And whereas the report aforesaid included the following paragraph:

That the Government of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to re-open the Federal-Provincial Conferences with a view to carrying forward the progress made at earlier conferences and arriving at an agreed procedure for the amending of the B. N. A. Act in Canada;

And whereas the Government of Canada did reconvene a Federal-Provincial Conference consisting of the Minister of Justice and other representatives of the Government of Canada together with the Attorneys-General or other ministerial representatives of the several provinces, to consider further the draft Constitution of Canada Amendment Act, previously prepared;

And whereas, as a result of the conference, a further and revised draft of an Act to provide for the Amendment in Canada of the Constitution of Canada, hereto appended and shown as Schedule "A", was prepared and approved by the Minister of Justice and the Attorneys-General or other ministerial representatives of the provinces; and was subsequently approved by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers of the provinces at a meeting held on the 14th day of October, 1964;

And whereas the further and revised draft Act prepared and approved as aforesaid (hereinafter called "the revised draft") has been submitted to, and considered by this House;

And whereas, since the said conference there has been an indication of public interest in the terms of the proposed Act;

Therefore be it resolved: That while this House approves the revised draft it recommends that the Government of Manitoba advise the Government of Canada of this resolution and request the Government of Canada to cause the revised draft (i) first to be submitted to a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada with a request that it be considered by the committee and that the said committee hold public hearings; and (ii) that the said committee report thereon to Parliament.

Now, Madam Speaker, perhaps it would not be necessary for me to read Schedule "A" which is part of this resolution but which has appeared in the Votes and Proceedings, and perhaps also you might wish to consider dispensing with the reading of the resolution.

(Following for the record, is Schedule "A", the reading of which was dispensed with:)

SCHEDULE "A"

October 14, 1964.

An Act to provide for the amendment
in Canada of the Constitution of Canada

WHEREAS the Senate and House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled have submitted Addresses to Her Majesty praying that Her Majesty may graciously be pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom for the enactment of the provisions hereinafter set forth:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

(SCHEDULE "A" cont'd).....

PART I

Power to amend the Constitution of Canada

1. Subject to this Part, the Parliament of Canada may make laws repealing, amending or re-enacting any provision of the Constitution of Canada.

2. No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of this Act or section 51A of the British North America Act, 1867, or affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada relating to

- (a) the powers of the legislature of a province to make laws,
- (b) the right or privileges granted or secured by the Constitution of Canada to the legislature or the government of a province,
- (c) the assets or property of a province,
- (d) the use of the English or French language,

shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of all the provinces.

3. (1) No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada that refers to one or more, but not all, of the provinces, shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislature of every province to which the provision refers.

(2) Section 2 of this Act does not extend to any provision of the Constitution of Canada referred to in subsection (1) of this section.

4. (1) No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada relating to education in any province other than Newfoundland shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of all the provinces other than Newfoundland.

(2) No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada relating to education in the province of Newfoundland shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislature of the province of Newfoundland.

(3) Sections 2 and 3 of this Act do not extend to any provision of the Constitution of Canada referred to in subsection (1) or (2) of this section.

5. No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada not coming within section 2, 3 or 4 of this Act shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the provinces representing at least fifty percent of the population of Canada according to the latest general census.

6. Notwithstanding anything in the Constitution of Canada, the Parliament of Canada may exclusively make laws from time to time amending the Constitution of Canada in relation to the executive Government of Canada, and the Senate and House of Commons, except as regards

- (a) the functions of the Queen and the Governor General in Relation to the Parliament or Government of Canada;
- (b) the requirements of the Constitution of Canada respecting a yearly session of Parliament;
- (c) the maximum period fixed by the Constitution of Canada for the duration of the House of Commons, except that the Parliament of Canada may, in time of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection, continue a House of Commons beyond such maximum period, if such continuation is not opposed by the votes of more than one-third of the members of such House;
- (d) the number of members by which a province is entitled to be represented in the Senate;
- (e) the residence qualifications of Senators and the requirements of the Constitution of Canada for the summoning of persons to the Senate by the Governor General in the Queen's name;
- (f) the right of a province to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of Senators representing such province;
- (g) the principles of proportionate representation of the provinces in the House of Commons prescribed by the Constitution of Canada; and
- (h) the use of the English or French language.

7. Notwithstanding anything in the Constitution of Canada, in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to the amendment from time to time of the

(SCHEDULE "A" cont'd).....

Constitution of the province, except as regards the office of Lieutenant-Governor.

8. Any law to repeal, amend or re-enact any provision of the Constitution of Canada that is not authorized to be made either by the Parliament of Canada under the authority of section 6 of this Act or by the legislature of a province under the authority of section 7 of this Act is subject to the provisions of sections 1 to 5 of this Act.

9. Nothing in this Part diminishes any power of the Parliament of Canada or of the legislature of a province, existing at the coming into force of this Act, to make laws in relation to any matter.

10. No Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the coming into force of this Act shall extend or be deemed to extend to Canada or to any province or territory of Canada as part of the law thereof.

11. Without limiting the meaning of the expression "Constitution of Canada", in this Part that expression includes the following enactments and any order, rule or regulation thereunder, namely,

- (a) the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1964;
- (b) the Manitoba Act, 1870;
- (c) the Parliament of Canada Act, 1875;
- (d) the Canadian Speaker (Appointment of Deputy) Act, 1895;
- (e) the Alberta Act;
- (f) the Saskatchewan Act;
- (g) the Statute of Westminster, 1931, in so far as it is part of the law of Canada; and
- (h) this Act.

PART II

British North America Act, 1867, amended

12. Class 1 of section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867, as enacted by the British North America (No. 2) Act, 1949, and class 1 of section 92 of the British North America Act, 1867, are repealed.

13. The British North America Act, 1867, is amended by re-numbering section 94A thereof as 94B and by adding thereto, immediately after section 94 thereof, the following heading and section:

Delegation of Legislative Authority

"94A. (1) Notwithstanding anything in this or in any other Act, the Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to any matters coming within the classes of subjects enumerated in classes (6), (10), (13) and (16) of section 92 of this Act, but no statute enacted under the authority of this subsection shall have effect in any province unless the legislature of that province has consented to the operation of such a statute in that province.

(2) The Parliament of Canada shall not have authority to enact a statute under subsection (1) of this section unless

- (a) prior to the enactment thereof the legislatures of at least four of the provinces have consented to the operation of such a statute as provided in that subsection, or
- (b) it is declared by the Parliament of Canada that the Government of Canada has consulted with the governments of all the provinces, and that the enactment of the statute is of concern to fewer than four of the provinces and the provinces so declared by the Parliament of Canada to be concerned have under the authority of their legislatures consented to the enactment of such a statute.

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this or in any other Act, the legislature of a province may make laws in the province in relation to any matter coming within the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

(4) No statute enacted by a province under the authority of subsection (3) of this section shall have effect unless

- (a) prior to the enactment thereof the Parliament of Canada has consented to the enactment of such a statute by the legislature of that province, and
- (b) a similar statute has under the authority of subsection (3) of this section been enacted by the legislatures of at least three other provinces.

(SCHEDULE 'A' cont'd).....

(5) The Parliament of Canada or the legislature of a province may make laws for the imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for enforcing any law made by it under the authority of this section.

(6) A consent given under this section may at any time be revoked, and

- (a) if a consent given under subsection (1) or (2) of this section is revoked, any law made by the Parliament of Canada to which such consent relates that is operative in the province in which the consent is revoked shall thereupon cease to have effect in that province, but the revocation of the consent does not affect the operation of that law in any other province, and
- (b) if a consent given under subsection (4) of this section is revoked, any law made by the legislature of a province to which the consent relates shall thereupon cease to have effect.

(7) The Parliament of Canada may repeal any law made by it under the authority of this section, in so far as it is part of the law of one or more provinces, but if any repeal under the authority of this subsection does not relate to all of the provinces in which that law is operative, the repeal does not affect the operation of that law in any province to which the repeal does not relate.

(8) The legislature of a province may repeal any law made by it under the authority of this section, but the repeal under the authority of this subsection of any law does not affect the operation in any other province of any law enacted by that province under the authority of this section."

PART III

French Version

14. The French version of this Act set forth in the Schedule to this Act shall form part of this Act.

PART IV

Citation and Commencement

15. This Act may be cited as the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act.

16. This Act shall come into force on the..... day of

Schedule

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, this is a matter of some considerable interest and I would want to have it clearly understood right from the beginning that I am not a constitutional lawyer and there are many in this Assembly who are in a much better position to discuss matters of this nature than I. However, it is my privilege to present this resolution and to make some brief introductory comments about it.

On September 1st, last year, 1964, I was privileged to attend along with the Honourable the First Minister a meeting held in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the 1864 meeting of representatives of four provinces and representatives from the Canadas which was the first formal occasion when the idea of confederation was suggested and when it was considered as a possibility. The September 1st meeting of 1864 led to the meeting on October 10th, 1864, at Quebec City, when the 72 resolutions were presented and approved and formed the basis of the British North America Act bringing into being our Canadian Confederation.

This was a union of the colonies in British North America, as it was then commonly known, and the British North America Act of 1867 had to be by virtue of the circumstances of those times, and indeed the circumstances under which it came into being, a statute of the Parliament of Great Britain. From that time until now, that statute having been a statute of the House of Commons of Great Britain, whenever it has been found desirable or necessary to make amendments to the Act, it has been necessary to return by way of petition to the House of Commons at Westminster requesting that changes be made, and a number have been made over the years, almost 100 years of our Canadian Confederation.

After there had been a considerable development in our country and when there had been the addition of other provinces, additional to those who were part of Confederation in 1867, an

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) interest began to be expressed in some way, some means, some method by which, when it was necessary, that amendments to our constitution could be made in Canada. These efforts began seriously in 1927 and have continued intermittently, and perhaps with some degree of continuity since that time. Certainly as we have increased in size as a country, as our population has increased, as we have come to take a greater and greater part in world affairs, propelled a great deal undoubtedly by the events of the First World War and the Second World War, the desire to enforce and undergird our status as a country and as a nation by being able to make amendments to our constitution has gained momentum and interest, and so it has been.

On the occasion of last September after having observed the 100th anniversary of that most important meeting of 1864 in Charlottetown, the day following, and in the same room that had been occupied by those men a hundred years ago, the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the provinces and the Attorneys-General met and it was decided as a matter of policy that everything possible should be done as quickly as possible to devise ways and means of having provision made for an amending formula which could be carried out within Canada itself, and the task of revising or up-dating the work that had been done so far by various meetings that have been held was given to the Minister of Justice and the Attorneys-General.

Subsequent to that date, that is the 2nd of September, 1964, three meetings of the Minister of Justice and the Attorneys-General were held culminating with our report to the Prime Minister and the Premiers on the 14th of October, 1964. The proposals that were presented at that time were considered satisfactory, having in mind all of the viewpoints that had to be taken into account. Now in considering -- it is the document that was prepared and presented to the meeting of the 14th of October as recited in the resolution before the members that is now before the members of this House for consideration and the action as indicated.

Now there are one or two basic points I think that have to be considered. One is that a basic decision, and I think that one could say that this has in effect been made, is that we should be able in Canada to make amendments to the Canadian Constitution. Indications are that the Parliament at Westminster would be glad if this were the case. They don't ask for or seek to retain that right which they now have to make amendments which affect Canada's Constitution and would be glad if we would take that task over ourselves, but a very basic decision to our consideration of this proposal is that.

If I may, Madam Speaker, I should like to just quote from a paragraph from my remarks to the meeting of Attorneys-General when we met following September 2nd, 1964, which deals I think specifically with this particular point, and I now quote. "In January 1950, and in subsequent constitutional conferences, the position of Manitoba has been that: (a) the Parliament of the United Kingdom should no longer be retained as the instrument of effecting legislative amendments to the British North America Act, 1867; (b) there should be established a procedure by which the constitutional statutes of Canada may be amended under legislation enacted by the Parliament of Canada, in which procedure special provision should be made for safeguarding the existing rights of racial and religious minorities and legitimate provincial claims to autonomy. The Government of Manitoba continues to subscribe to these principles."

I think that that correctly sets forth the position that had been taken consistently throughout the various meetings that have been held on this important topic, but I think, as I say, that it is important to bear that in mind that we are agreed that there should be some mechanism by which our Canadian Constitution can be amended in Canada.

Having decided that, the rather more difficult task is then of course to determine what the basis or the means by which this may be accomplished from time to time as may be necessary, and while there may be general agreement on the first matter there is some difference of opinion and properly so on the second. There are different opinions, but I would put before this House the suggestion that the draft bill, which is contained as Schedule "A" to the resolution before the members, represents as I see it the largest consensus of opinion that we have been able so far to achieve.

It is basically and virtually the same formula as was discussed and in a sense accepted largely accepted in the meetings of 1960 and 1961. There have been some minor changes but basically it is the same formula and, as I say, it is I think the point at which we have the largest consensus of opinion by governments and indeed I think the largest consensus of public opinion.

Now that is not to overlook the fact, Madam Speaker, that of course there are differings of opinions with respect to individual matters. There are those who may argue that the proposed

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) formula is too rigid; and, on the other hand, those who will argue that the proposed formula is not rigid enough. In this matter it is difficult perhaps to arrive at a point where everyone is agreed on exactly what the formula would be. I put it forward, Madam Speaker, from my limited knowledge of the historical development of the province and from hearing the discussions and understanding the viewpoints as being as I say a fair consensus of the opinion and a reasonable basis upon which this important matter may be conducted in our own country.

Now, Madam Speaker, some few days ago I was able to distribute to the members of the House a very splendid booklet known as a "White Paper" on the amendment of the Constitution of Canada issued by the Honourable the Minister of Justice, and I would particularly direct the member's attention to the pages beginning at Page No. 32 and running through to Page No. 53, and if the members will read that, as undoubtedly they already have done, but if they will read it again they will find there as clear an explanation of the formula which is before us in this draft Act as any that I or anyone else could give. It is I believe a very thorough explanation of the formula and of the consequences which might be expected to flow from it, and a fair statement of the matters which are before us in the form of this -- and I will not weary the House by in any way repeating the material that is there in that very splendid exposition of this matter.

I would perhaps however make one or two comments just about the general format of the draft bill. It has two general parts. One is with regard to the amending procedure itself, and members will notice that that is divided into two parts, certain matters which require unanimous consent of all the provinces in order that there may be an amendment, and these are generally spoken of as matters which are entrenched; and the other where a majority, which under our present system means seven provinces, would be required before an amendment could be made; and the members will follow I think without any difficulty the distinction between those two situations.

There are of course in addition, in the bill itself, those matters in which the Parliament of Canada by itself may propose amendments, and there are certain restrictions as to that right. Then of course there is the authority which provinces have with regard to the amendment of their own constitution of the province, and both of those items which were formerly in -- which are, I shouldn't say formerly because this hasn't been adopted yet -- but which are presently in the British North America Act as amended are both included in this amending formula.

The other important section of the proposed bill is that having to do with the delegation of legislative authority. The concept of delegation is not one which has been followed to any great extent in Canadian law-making and is one with which perhaps we are not particularly familiar. The idea of delegating and having a provision for delegation of legislative authority arose, as I understand it, to meet in part the concern of those who felt that the amending procedure, that is the first part of the Act, was perhaps too restrictive or too binding or whatever word would be proper under the circumstances, and so it was thought that if there were suitable arrangements made under which there might be delegation from the Federal Parliament to provinces or from provinces to the Federal Parliament, authority to delegate the right to make laws with respect to certain matters, that that might ease the situation and make the first part of the formula perhaps more acceptable.

A great deal of debate took place in 1960 and 1961 and in our meetings in 1964 respecting the number of provinces that would be required in order to have the delegation procedure come into effect. The procedure, members will note, set out in the proposed bill is in effect where four provinces agree to the delegation, that is applicable either way, that is by way of delegation to the Federal Parliament or delegation by the Federal Parliament to the provinces, that four provinces are the minimum number in effect. The effective meaning of the provision is that four provinces are required.

Now there are those who argued and do argue that delegation ought to be possible with one province; and, on the other hand, there are those who argued that the delegation ought only to come into effect where there were a majority of provinces, which in our case would mean seven -- I think seven provinces -- there were those who argued for the seven provinces. This was particularly during the meetings that I attended. The case for example of the Province of Alberta, and as I say other provinces argued that it should be some number less than four. Some argued for three, two, and some even for one. Now there is, as I say, room for difference of opinion. The point I'm just wanting to draw to the members' attention is that the effective provision at the moment in the draft bill is for four provinces.

There is one item and I would particularly direct members' attention because it is

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) mentioned on Page 42 of the White Paper, the third paragraph down from the top of the page, because this points out that whereas in the case of the delegation from the provinces to the Federal Parliament the number of subject matters in which there may be delegation is restricted, but as the White Paper points out, and I now quote, "Clause (3) does not similarly restrict the subjects in which Section 91, concerning which authority to enact a specific law may be delegated to the provinces."

If the members will turn over to Page 78 of the White Paper, on Pages 78 and 79 and at the top of Page 80 they will see there enumerated the subject matters which are within the powers of Parliament, and there might be an argument to be made that perhaps there ought to be some designation of the subjects which could be delegated within which Parliament might delegate to a province the right to make laws. For example, I would be inclined to think that we would say, just to take one or two illustrations, that it would hardly be a very happy circumstance if the right to make laws with respect to weights and measures were delegated by the Parliament of Canada to the provinces, and perhaps that is an item that ought to be excluded from the possibility of delegation. There are currency and coinage, and other matters which will occur to the members as they look over that particular list.

The point I want to make is that as the draft bill is at the present time there is no restriction on the matters which might be delegated, under proper circumstances as outlined in the draft bill, which might be delegated from the Federal Parliament to the provinces, and perhaps there is an argument to be made per se that the subjects within which such delegation could take place ought to be specified in the draft bill. That is a matter which is worthy of some consideration and has received some attention from those who have from time to time commented upon the draft that is presently before us.

Now, Madam Speaker, there has been a considerable interest indicated in the proposed draft since the meeting of the 14th of October, 1964. The members will be aware of action that has been taken in other provinces and public discussion that has arisen, and so the members will note that we are, by this resolution, indicating our approval of this revised draft as representing the consensus of opinion which we believe is a consensus of opinion and of the position to which we have been able to come so far, but suggesting that this matter might receive further study by having it submitted to a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada with a request that it be considered by that committee and thus allow those who would like to have the matter considered further a proper opportunity to do so; and, for example, at which time one of the things, that could be considered is the very point that I was making a few moments ago. We are putting this forward because we believe that this will serve as a useful opportunity and a proper vehicle within which opinions with regard to the proposals might be properly and adequately expressed.

I might tell the members, Madam Speaker, that a somewhat similar idea has been adopted by the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, the difference there being that they have recommended that the proposed act be submitted to a committee of the House of Commons or, alternatively be submitted to the Senate with a request that it be considered by a committee thereof. By and large it's the same idea in principle, not entirely the same but very closely to it.

Well, Madam Speaker, with that introduction, and knowing as I have already said that there will be those much better able to discuss the detailed matters which are set forth in the bill, I present this resolution for the consideration of the House. I want to conclude on one point -- to return indeed to a point that I made at the beginning, that everything we say and do in this particular matter is based I believe on our commonly accepted belief and opinion that we should be able to make necessary amendments to the Canadian Constitution in Canada, and if you accept that, then I think we must be prepared to accept perhaps something less than what we might consider a perfect formula for doing it, because if we wait for perfection they'll be talking about this a hundred years from now and we won't be making much progress.

What I'm trying to say is that if we believe that this is right and proper that amendments should be made in Canada, then there will have to be a certain accommodation to perhaps differing views as to the formula which is correct. I think that we may be said to have made considerable progress in this country by having arrived at the point where we are at the present time, and I commend to the members the resolution now before them.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General has copies of his statements that he read to the conference that he referred to that was held at Charlottetown. If so, may I obtain a copy?

MR. McLEAN: I didn't make any speech at Charlottetown. I read only from a statement

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) made to the meeting of the Attorneys-General. It would be September, some date in September. The one that I just read?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. McLEAN: That would be in Hansard of course.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, that's all there is to it?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, okay then.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: The next resolution has to do with the Committee on Credit, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, on Friday evening when my Leader was speaking, I was called out for a few moments and there are a couple of points that I wasn't sure whether he had brought up or not. I have since talked to him and if I were to speak now I would just repeat what he said on Friday evening, so I do not intend to take the time of the House to repeat what he said.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, could we now revert to the Committee on Ways and Means motion, and after that go into the Committee of Supply.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand? If anyone else wishes to speak, I'd be glad if they would do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand.

. continued on next page

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 Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we start in on the resumption of the Department of Health, the other evening the, I believe it was the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce suggested that the next committee to be considered would be that of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. As we're aware, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we were not able to complete the Department of the Attorney-General, and I would like to know if it's the intention to complete the Attorney-General's Department before we go into Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I'm sorry I didn't make myself clear at that time. I think the question the Leader of the Opposition asked me was, were we going to complete Health and then revert to the Attorney-General, and then, after that, which department would be considered, and I said that the third department in that case would be Mines and Resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're now on Resolution No. 55, item No. (11), page 17.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we haven't passed No. (9). I was -- Mr. Chairman, we have not. I was addressing the committee at the time that ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. We passed No. (9) and the Minister of Health made a correction, and then you unfortunately went back to it again, but we had passed No. (9).

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Well then, am I permitted to ask the Minister to give me the answers? Am I permitted to get answers to the question that I asked of the Minister then -- in reference to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister answered them. We passed No. (9) and we spent quite a lot of time on

MR. SMERCHANSKI: But if the Minister did not answer my question, then I mean, will I be given an opportunity to bring it up again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I think you've had quite a lot of opportunities and you asked that ...

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Yes, but he hasn't answered it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: and he answered them. We're on No. (11) on page 17 ... (11)(a).

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we did not pass Item (7). That was left in abeyance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Correct. That's correct. We must come back to Item (7) before we pass this department, but now we are on (11) and we will come back to (7) some time. -- (Interjection) -- No, we're on (11). We'll come back to (7) though before we finish with the department.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): the fact that the Honourable Member from Burrows had the floor when the 11 o'clock was called

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think so, but in any event we had passed No.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if he was permitted to speak, if he had the floor on this number at that time, he certainly should be entitled to get some answers. I mean that's only natural.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health answered his questions.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think that we should ask the Minister if he minds answering these questions. I think that we were very co-operative on that day. This went very fast. We started on the Minister's Salary; we're practically finished except this No. (7), because we couldn't get the answer at the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. (7) we haven't passed, and we're on No. (11).

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with No. (11), I wonder if the Minister could outline to us what is being done insofar as this is concerned, and does this apply insofar as graduates' bursaries, provincial bursaries, etcetera, to those who are going into the medical profession. On a number of times I've raised the question in the House when we are dealing with the Department of Health that it's in my opinion time for a change insofar as the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) costs of obtaining a medical degree. I note that in the Province of Newfoundland a change has been made there whereby the excessive costs of the individual going into medicine are considerably reduced, and I would like to hear from the Minister if this is the particular item that may deal with that and to hear, if that is the case, what is being done here in Manitoba.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, this item provides \$5,000 to the Manitoba School of Nursing Education and it is also providing bursaries for some 14 dental students and 7 medical students, which takes up the balance of approximately \$15,000; so \$5,000 of it goes to the Manitoba School of Nursing Education and the other \$15,000 is given to these various bursaries. When we give these bursaries we usually have an agreement with the --well, not usually, we always have an agreement with either the dental student or the medical student that they will spend one year practicing in the rural parts of the province for each bursary that they receive.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister whether any extra effort has been attempted to draw this to the attention of pre-medical students at the University or those --that if they were aware of additional bursaries to be given to students who undertake to go into the field of medicine. If I heard the Honourable Minister correctly, it seemed to me that it's a rather insignificant number who are taking advantage or obtaining these provincial bursaries that goes into the field of medicine. Now I'm hopeful. I'm optimistic that one of these days we are going to have a Medicare system in Canada and in Manitoba. One of the fears that has been expressed that if we did have a comprehensive system of Medicare would be a shortage of doctors, and I think that this may be true to some degree. On the other hand, however, I do think that the provincial authority should be making the field of medicine far more attractive to young men and women.

Now, we're all aware of the fact that at the conclusion of the Second World War, through the programs at the federal level, aids were given to those boys and girls who had fought for us to complete and to continue their education. I think, Mr. Chairman, it's a fact that a considerable number of the doctors that we have in Manitoba at the present time are individuals who were able to take advantage of that assistance, and I would like to obtain from the Minister of Health as to whether any selling job has been done insofar as these bursaries are concerned, and while I say this, Mr. Chairman, I realize that if there were more who were going to be assisted, the amount that we're considering at the present time would have to be materially increased. I would have no objections at all to an increase over this \$20,000 as far as we're concerned, if we were going to achieve what I'm sure that we all feel is desirable, that is, greater provision of medical personnel in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the amount of money that we have available has been meeting the needs in this area. Just what promotion is given to the new student that is going into the Faculty of Medicine or the Faculty of Dentistry, I'm sorry I cannot answer the honourable member. These are basically what are known as the David A. Stewart Bursaries and the applications are made through the University and then the awards are made in conjunction with the Department of Health and the University of Manitoba --the deans of the two faculties. There are quite a number, I believe now of the students that are taking advantage of the Canada Educational Loans. Our loans have a qualification to them that the student that has them must practice one year in the rural parts of the province. But we have been --we've had two meetings now with the College of Physicians and Surgeons to talk about the problem of doctor supply and of bursaries, and I have asked for a meeting with the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine to discuss the David A. Stewart award, and particularly the re-establishment of what was termed the preceptorship program that had been operating up to a few years ago. At that time I can make enquiries as to what promotion or what information is provided to the new student as to the bursaries that are available to him.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to thank the Minister for his statement, Mr. Chairman, and I trust that at that meeting not only will he ask as to what is said to the students who are feeling that they may embark on a career in medicine, but that he goes further than that and that next year the Minister will be able to tell us that they've expanded this program so that more young men and young women will feel inclined, at least as far as the financial aspects are concerned, to go into the field of medicine.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister stated that there'd be \$5,000 for the School of Nursing. I wonder if the same clause is also there for these --for any of these student nurses. Do they have to practice or, well, to stay in the province any number of years

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....once they graduate? And another question, is this \$5,000 only --are only those going for their R.N. eligible for this? Is there anything for the practical nurses under bursaries?

MR. WITNEY: There is no such qualification made on the \$5,000.00. Perhaps a little further explanation on this is that the University's Manitoba School of Nursing Education was organized in July of '43 for two purposes: To prepare registered nurses for executive positions in hospitals and for training in teaching hospitals; and secondly, to train nurses for public health work. The costs were met by a federal government wartime grant until the end of 1944-45 of that year. Canada then withdrew support, and the provinces, rather than see the two courses discontinued, agreed to make up an annual contribution to the University of \$5,000 or one-half of their operating deficit.

MR. DESJARDINS:.....grants for some young students going in for nursing at all? There's no such a thing as bursary for that?

MR. CHAIRMAN:.....(b)--passed; (c)--passed; (12) (a)--passed; (b)passed.....

MR. PAULLEY:.....the Minister would very briefly explain the increase in (b) of (12).

MR. WITNEY: Yes the increase is to provide for --we have a contract with doctors in The Pas to provide for the non-Indian medical indigent people in the whole of the north country, north of 53.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (13) --passed; (14) (a)--passed. (b)--passed.....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in (14) there are some substantial increases particularly under (a). The total appropriation is up 30 percent. Is there a new program or simply an extension of the present?

MR. WITNEY: We are going to take on three of the dental hygienists that are graduating from the Faculty of Dentistry at the University of Manitoba to increase our health education program, our program throughout the schools and our program throughout various organizations. We also have in here an additional typist to take care of the increased secretarial work.

MR. MOLGAT: I note from the report of the department that the province is broken down into three regions for the purposes of this particular program. Region 1 has some 23 municipalities in it; Region 2 some 12 municipalities; and Region 3, 11 municipalities, I'm referring now to pages 153 and 154 of the annual report. And yet when you look at the inspections, Region 1 has only had 550 inspections, children's dental inspections, with 23 municipalities, whereas Region 2, for example, with 12 municipalities has had 5,000 inspections. In other words there are less, there are approximately half the number of municipalities but there are ten times the number of inspections. I wonder if the Minister could indicate why there is this discrepancy in the program.

MR. WITNEY: I believe the discrepancy really is a result of the areas that are involved. I couldn't tell you just exactly where Region 1 is, but I believe it's up in one of the scattered areas of the province where it's not easy to get around, whereas Region 4, for instance, is the Metropolitan Winnipeg area and you have all of the people in a very concentrated area. Now, I see the Honourable Member nod his head. I should get out my book here and just check on that. It may also be a factor of staff. We are short of staff, of course, in this field because of the fact that there are a shortage of dentists and a shortage of technicians, but now that we are able to add three and as we are able to get more dentists we of course will be able to fill to completion the various vacancies that are in these particular regions, and when that is done we will then, of course, be able to increase our activities, but I think it is possibly a function that in each one of those areas we have not yet come up to our full complement of staff.

MR. PAULLEY:the question of dentists, I notice in the report on page 152 the established positions include eight dentists. How many dentists actually are there?

MR. WITNEY: We have at the present time nine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (14) (a)--passed. (b)--passed.....

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under this connection I notice on page 154 that there are certain studies going on, and under item (e) it says five towns received pre-fluoridation surveys in preparation for instalment of treatment systems. Since there are conflicting reports coming out from time to time in connection with fluoridation, what is the situation? Are we still promoting fluoridation, or has there been a final conclusion reached in this matter that it is good or not?

MR. WITNEY: Under fluoridation, if a municipal council decides that they want to have fluoridation of their water supplies then we provide for them the technical assistance to establish

(MR. WITNEY cont'd).....the necessary fluoridating equipment and also to keep a check on it to see that the right amounts are being used.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, on this point I'd certainly like to encourage the Minister to see if not more dentists could be picked up because I know in some municipalities they have been concerned about this, because they're asked to take this dental care during the summer holidays and, as we all know, this is practically impossible for the teachers to get the students together, and if they do not take it there they usually lose their position during the other part of the year, and I'd sure like to encourage, to see --this dental situation in the rural parts could be greatly improved if they could be obtained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed.....

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, for theof the Opposition I'll try to get more information later as to the number of inspections in here. My answer is not complete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (14) (b)--passed. (15) (a)--passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with (15) Provincial Laboratory, I note, again referring back to the report of the department on page 158, at the bottom of the page it deals with detailed services including, among other things, milk and water examinations, food examinations. I wonder if the Minister could give us a brief resume of what has happened insofar as milk and water examinations insofar as contamination is concerned, and also in respect of food examinations.

MR. WITNEY: Do you mean numbers, or are you meaning have we found many incidents of milk and water contamination? It is my understanding on the examinations that are being taken on a routine basis that there is not, at least nothing has been drawn to my attention of any undue concern about milk or water contamination. The situation is watched steadily and if discrepancies or problems do arise, then of course the health people take action in order to overcome it. But again from the report, if I can recall correctly in my mind what was said about the provincial laboratories, there were no undue incidents noticed during the past year.

MR. PAULLEY:that there are continuous examinations and laboratory tests made into the, I believe it's Strontium 90, content in milk, and if so has the Minister any documents or figures there as to what the status is at the present time?

MR. WITNEY: I have no figures, Mr. Chairman, as to what the status is but there is a committee that has been set up in collaboration with the Federal Government that is constantly monitoring, and they issue a report I believe it's either once a month or perhaps not quite as often as that. It's a highly technical report; it goes to Ottawa, a copy comes to my office, and the indications are that there is nothing for anyone to be concerned about at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: These examinations or tests are taken all over the province are they, Mr. Chairman? Then are they examined here in Manitoba or are they transmitted to Ottawa for examination, or what is the procedure insofar as this is concerned?

MR. WITNEY: It is my understanding that they are taken at selected points in the province, they are examined here, and the results of the examinations are kept here and forwarded to Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY:that reports are made back to you as Minister of Health here in the Province of Manitoba. Is that correct?

MR. WITNEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (15) (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed; (16)--passed. (17) (a)--passed.

MR. PAULLEY:situation regarding the RH factor in the Province of Manitoba. I know that this was a matter of some concern a few years ago and that is the reason, as I understand it, for this grant being in there at the present time. I wonder if the Minister could tell us of the number of babies who have been found in connection with this RH factor.

MR. WITNEY: It may take a moment, Mr. Chairman. I believe it's contained here. I have no data, Mr. Chairman, to answer the honourable member's question but I can obtain it for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (16)--passed; (17) (a)--passed; (b) passed.....

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK (Ethelbert Plains):.....tell us where the offices are located in this particular item and just what this item consists of, the Northern Health Services?

MR. WITNEY: The main office is located at The Pas and there are nursing stations up the Hudson Bay Line. One of them is at Wabowden, another is at Thicket Portage, another's at Ilford and Cormorant, and then of course there is a station at Churchill. We also have two new stations, one at Grand Rapids and one at Easterville. There is also another station at

(MR. WITNEY cont'd).....Moose Lake. We have two public health nurses at Churchill, I think we have two operating --or one operating up the Bay line, there's one in Lynn Lake, and the number in The Pas escapes me just at this moment.

MR. HRYHORCZUK:.....stations that were names by the Honourable Minister, what type of staff have they got? There were some smaller ones there that you mentioned. And what are the services? Just what does it consist of, and have you any doctors at those stations at all?

MR. WITNEY: They have nursing aides at these stations and in some areas we have lay dispensers for the dispensing of drugs. The people come to the nursing stations for pre-natal and post-natal care and for other minor problems, for inoculations and immunizations, and any difficulties that might arise that require the assistance of a doctor we have been able to improve the communication system now and they phone to The Pas, and at The Pas the medical officer of health gives them the necessary information or provides the transportation for them to come down the line or across to Thompson to one of the hospitals. The doctors also make a regular trip about once a month up the line to see the people for themselves.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: In addition; to these services, Mr. Chairman, does the Federal Government provide any health services that are a duplication of these, or are your services outside the Indian reserves altogether?

MR. WITNEY: We have an agreement with the Federal Government whereby we look after, on one half of the province up there, the Indian and the Metis people and on the other half the Indian Health Services look after the Indian and Metis, so there's really no duplication. The federal health service have built a number of hospitals over the period of years --or not hospitals but nursing stations I suppose you would call them-- and the two departments are operating closely together in the north country to prevent a duplication of service and to provide what might be termed a co-ordinated service for the people in the area.

MR. HRYHORCZUK:are any doctors provided by the Federal Government at all in this area?

MR. WITNEY: There is an Indian Health doctor at The Pas and there is an Indian Health doctor at Churchill. To my knowledge there are just the two.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this department I believe this covers Churchill, and on reading Page 171 of the report of the department, reference is made to the question of sewage disposal in Thompson and also garbage collection, etcetera. It doesn't seem very good insofar as the report is concerned, as to the situation there. Also we are aware of the fact that there has been a change made insofar as Churchill is concerned, in the over-all picture with the withdrawal of the armed services there. I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Health could give a resume of what is happening at Churchill insofar as health and sanitation is concerned, and whether or not--I understand that there was some difficulties there before, and to what degree has the federal authority come in and taken over insofar as health and sanitation at Churchill is concerned?

MR. WITNEY: The Department of Health, the Northern Health Services, operates the system for garbage and sewage collection, and we have recently added another public health nurse in the area in order to help cope with the heavy load that we have. We have also recently established in the Churchill area a deputy officer of health by using one of the doctors that is in Churchill at the present time. The Federal Government, of course, have a doctor of Northern Health Services operating in the area, and I believe they have also a doctor up there for the Indian Services. There are difficulties at Churchill, particularly with the type of terrain that we have to deal with, and with the climate that we have to operate with up there. Our method of meeting it has really been to take one of the doctors up there and to make him a deputy officer of health and to add another health nurse in the area, who work very closely with the Indian and Metis people in particular, and to try to maintain in good working operation the sanitation facilities that we have up there in the pumping out of the various collection places and continual maintenance of the water supplies of Churchill.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would again refer to Page 171 and I've underlined one portion. It's the last sentence in the report dealing with Churchill, and this is what it says: "Garbage collection is still rather spasmodic, but the Town Administrator is aware of the inadequacies of the service and is attempting to improve conditions." Now I'm sure that I don't have to say to the Minister of Health how important it is that we have adequate garbage collection, and that if garbage collection is on a rather spasmodic basis, as suggested in the report, the situation isn't very good, and as we know, garbage can be the source of disease and so on. Then again, as I say the Town Administrator is aware of this and the inadequacies of the service,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....and is attempting to improve the conditions. Now as we got this report, Mr. Chairman, for the calendar year 1964, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister could indicate to the committee what steps have been taken to resolve this question of inadequacy by the Administrator at Churchill.

MR. WITNEY: The medical officers of health up until the time that we appointed a deputy medical officer of health, who of course will now have responsibility for this particular situation, have been going up to Churchill more often than they had before, and we have made arrangements with the doctor at the northern local health unit in Flin Flon to use his services too so that we can keep a closer check on matters up until we had appointed a deputy medical officer of health. The local government administrator I think also was operating a bit under difficulties of climatic conditions at the time, but to my knowledge the situation is now satisfactory.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate very much the fact, as the Minister says, that there may be additional professional personnel gone up there to look over the situation, and I join with him in saying that they do have these adverse climatic conditions, but I would respectfully suggest to my honourable friend it may be that the inadequacy of the service is the provision of personnel other than professional insofar as the removal of garbage and the likes of that is concerned. Now, is one of the reasons for this inadequacy the inability, or the financial picture, that did not make it possible for the administrator in Churchill to have necessary manpower to look after this situation there or not? Again I say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact insofar as the medical aspect of it is concerned, with more inspections and the likes of that is concerned, but it does seem to me, and I may be wrong in this but it does appear to me that from the sentence or two in the report dealing with the garbage collection and the likes of that, this is something in a field other than that for strictly medical personnel. I wonder if the Minister could enlighten us on that basis?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's apparent that the answers I've given now haven't given any confidence to the honourable member. I do not believe that it's a matter of inadequacy of funds or equipment, but apart from that I can only say to the honourable member that the reports coming to me, as the Minister of Health, indicate that the situation in Churchill is satisfactory at the present time.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out, is there any Indian Federal Health personnel at places like Easterville and Moose Lake at the present time, or is all the Federal Indian work undertaken by the Northern Health Services?

MR. WITNEY: At Easterville and Moose Lake the work is undertaken by the Northern Health Services.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: It's completely undertaken by this Northern Health Services is it?

MR. WITNEY: Yes.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Well then, if it's doing some of the Indian, Department of Indian Affairs, where does the credit or the charges that are made to the Federal Government, where are they shown in connection with Item Number (17)? In other words, Mr. Chairman, if the Northern Services are doing a service for the Federal Government under the Indian Department there must be some recovery of services rendered to the Federal Indian Department. Now would it not be proper to show the recovery from the Federal Government in reference to this?

MR. WITNEY: It's a division. We do not receive any recoveries from the Federal Government for our work in that particular area, nor do we assess them for the areas that they have taken under their jurisdiction, so it is just a matter that we have more or less split the province and I forget exactly where it is. It goes down the Bay line and I believe that we take the area to the East of the Hudson Bay line and the federal services take the area to the west of the Hudson Bay line in these areas, and they operate there and we operate on the other side.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Does this mean then, Mr. Chairman, that our Northern Health Services Unit in a place like Island Lake or Gods Lake is really completely under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and that the Provincial Northern Services have no say in the operation of these health units in these locations?

MR. WITNEY: No, I believe that in that particular area that we are the people who are responsible for the health services in that area.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, this is just the point. I can't seem to quite follow this type of reasoning. We have a division in the province in which the federal government appears to be responsible in one instance and the provincial government is responsible in another instance, and yet in a place like Gods Lake and Island Lake there appears to be a duplication of

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....service, because both the provincial and federal people do have something to do with the health units. Now to me it's very confusing in that if the provincial health service is rendering a service to the federal Indian Affairs Department, then there should be some recovery because just to have an arbitrary split, there's no control as to the amount of medical attention that is required in one area. There should be some compensating feature to find out what the actual costs are --say on a unit basis or number of patients treated. To me it seems to be a very, rather just a loosely worded sort of a situation, where we as a province are rendering service to the Federal Government without proper compensation.

MR. FROESE: The Minister mentioned that certain areas came under the Northern Health Services and certain areas were provided for by the federal government. Would this work out to be about a 50-50 arrangement, or what is the formula?

MR. WITNEY: It is my understanding that the areas that have taken over under this agreement --it's a loose form of agreement-- that our costs in our area are approximately about the same as their costs in the other areas. So it works out to be just about, well about 50-50.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should have said this at the offset when we got down to the item No. (17). I would like to express the appreciation of myself and others in my group to the doctors and nurses who are up in these areas, because we're well aware of the fact that many of the areas that the nurses particularly have to cover are, shall I say just starting out in communities. Many of them, of course, have been there for generations but I think a vote of appreciation should go at this particular stage to the nurses and the doctors who are undertaking health services in the scattered parts of the northern part of Manitoba. I know a few of them. I know that they are doing a very good job, and it is a pleasure for me to be able to pay a tribute to them for the work they are doing.

One more specific question insofar as the north is concerned, and this deals with the question of the Hudson Bay Railway in the north. There used to be a medical car which went, I believe, from The Pas up to Churchill and stopped off periodically at various points on the Hudson Bay line. Is this car still operating, Mr. Chairman? I wonder if the Minister could inform me.

MR. WITNEY: The answer is no, Mr. Chairman, and with respect to the staff, I have been up the Bay line with them, seen the area that they are working under and know, not only up in the north country but in some of the other remote areas in the province, for instance in some of the areas that might not be considered remote, areas such as Camperville and Duck Bay, the work that these people do, and I thank the honourable member for remembering them and join with him in the commendation to these people.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks):.....Mr. Chairman, in regard to northern health services, I note on Page 166 and I quote: "This organization is now in its fifth year of operation," and I'm referring to the Northern Health Services. "The original five-year plan as set out in 1959 has by and large been completed." Mr. Chairman, I'm dismayed by the fact that there hasn't been some mention during this five-year plan of air ambulance for the north, because the Royal Commission on Health Services have definite recommendations for the north when they recommend air ambulances, medical depots and nursing stations in remote areas. When I read on Page 167, and I again wish to quote: "The Department acknowledges that communications and transportation still remain difficult from isolated areas where there is no rail or road facilities, but despite this there have been few instances where patients have not been attended to and brought to the nearest hospital of severely ill, even from some of the most remote areas." It goes on to say that Manitoba Government Air Service and Lands Airways have at all times been co-operative, and many times in the House, Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out by members like the Honourable Member for Burrows who has considerable experience in the north, that people do rally around an emergency and by some way or another we do get people out of the north, but I'm going to submit that it's pretty near time now that we laid out another plan for the north in view of the fact that we have cities like Thompson springing up. The day must come when we're going to consider some better way of emergency transportation, because a plane that's equipped with oxygen, planes that are equipped similar to the ones they have in Saskatchewan, are going to become a necessity, and I look forward to the day when this department will certainly look into that aspect of the services for the north.

MR. WITNEY:.....a comment Mr. Chairman, that the ambulance survey for the whole of the province and the Metropolitan area is now completed, and what their recommendations are I don't know, but that was one of the areas that they were asked to consider.

MR. DESJARDINS: the present, is it the same arrangement that we've had before that the, I think it was the Air Force, the Department of Transportation was taking care of this, any emergency that arose in the north? This was a question that we received a few years ago when this was brought up.

MR. WITNEY: Emergency transportation is provided in numerous ways, but with respect to air the Manitoba Government Air Service now have a plane equipped with wheels for break-up and freeze-up periods, and there are of course more airports in the north country now operating on a full 24-hour basis. When they are not available for some reason or another, we make use of the private aircrafts such as the private air companies at The Pas and some of them up the Bay line.

MR. DESJARDINS: the Honourable Member was saying, is there any equipment such as oxygen and so on that is stationed here or that can be available somewhere for these emergencies?

MR. WITNEY: When an emergency call is made, professional people go with it and they take all that they deem to be necessary.

MR. MOLGAT: for a few moments. Maybe the Minister has been asked this question and possibly has given the information. How many doctors are there in this particular end of it, the Northern Health Services, and where are they located?

MR. WITNEY: We have two doctors in the Northern Health Services. Both are located at The Pas, and we have another doctor for the Northern Health Services in Flin Flon.

MR. MOLGAT: We were discussing the other night the situation at Churchill, the fact that with the removal of the army base there it left the town and some six thousand people with only one doctor. Is it the intention of the department to do anything about locating some of their personnel at Churchill or not?

MR. WITNEY: No, we do not intend to locate any of our doctors at Churchill but we have appointed one of the doctors up there as a deputy medical officer of health.

MR. MOLGAT: What about the situation at Grand Rapids where there was a very large population for, certainly during the construction period, and now most of these people will be moved out. What are the plans for servicing that area and the adjoining Easterville location?

MR. WITNEY: We have established two new modern nursing stations at Grand Rapids and at Easterville. We have also established a public health nurse in the area and we have made arrangements with the Manitoba Hydro Electric Company for emergency transportation.

MR. MOLGAT: There'll be no doctor located, however, at either location?

MR. WITNEY: There will be no doctor located at either location but there is communication and the communication is good between there and The Pas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (17) (a) passed.

MR. WITNEY: and radio telephone and communication by radio.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to find out from the Minister that the people that pay their hospitalization under the Manitoba Hospital Commission, are any of these funds turned over to the Northern Health Services because the Northern Health Services are carrying on certain services which is equivalent to some of the hospitals in the more settled areas? Is there any change of grants or fees in this instance?

MR. WITNEY: No.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: How is the Northern Health Service units, how are they financed at the present time? Where do they get their capital for the buildings and the equipment and all other equipment that they require?

MR. WITNEY: Well, the money that is needed is in the (b) estimate here, and then when we do have buildings to develop it comes under the Item No. 3, Provincial Buildings and Other Projects, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (17) (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (18) (a)--passed; (b)--passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister explain what this program is? I note that it's completely covered by a federal government grant of \$650,000.00. What is the program and what are we doing?

MR. WITNEY: This is a wide number of items under a general health grant. I'm not sure whether I can give him a complete list of them. In some cases, there is money here for assistance toward the health units throughout the province, and in the report the general health grant-- as it states here, it's used to improve existing programs and to extend services in various fields which are not covered by specific grants, and the allocation is for the following purposes, and this is on page 12 of the summary of activities. It's for salaries of additional

(MR. WITNEY cont'd). staff and the purchase of supplies for the public health laboratory at Dauphin, health education, environmental sanitation, local health units and payment of one-half of the cost of salaries of additional staff and the purchase of supplies for venereal disease control, laboratory and X-ray units, salaries and travelling expenses for additional staff for the City of Winnipeg Health Department, purchase of equipment for use in the homes of poliomyelitis, and all the way down to Item number 12, surveys of existing occupational health facilities in Manitoba, purchase of equipment to provide a mobile clinic to bring dental services to communities, employment of Indian and Metis girls to serve as lay dispensers, etc., in that list.

MR. MOLGAT: what the Minister has read from there then is what has been done in the past year with this money. Is that correct?

MR. WITNEY: Not only what has been done, but what is being continued throughout the fiscal period to come.

MR. MOLGAT: But the appropriation, as we see it here, is completely covered by a grant from the federal government, and yet a number of the items listed indicate payment of one-half; for example the cost of salaries, or payment of one-half the cost of purchase, payment of 50 percent of the cost of salaries. Are there other items elsewhere in the estimates then relating to the same thing? Because on this basis here it doesn't tie in with the statements in the report.

MR. WITNEY: There are other items. For instance, in some of our laboratories we have staff listed that do not show up, say, in the item on provincial laboratories, because their salary is paid by this health grant, and it's shown up here because the total amount is \$650,000 and the Federal Government pays \$650,000. Some of the supplies are paid in half by this grant. When we go through the items, say again the provincial laboratories, half of it will be included in the item in the estimates and the other half will come out of this particular grant. It threads all the way through the estimates of the Department of Health and the various departments. Venereal disease control, etc.

MR. MOLGAT: Some of the related items, then, appear elsewhere in the estimates and not under this item. One of the programs here is a survey of existing occupational health facilities in Manitoba. Has that been undertaken and at what stage does it stand?

MR. WITNEY: We are constantly undertaking surveys of existing occupational health problems. Silicosis, for instance, in the annual surveys that are made on silicosis, and recently on some of these mercury seed-cleaning plants there has been work done in that field, work done in areas where carbon tetrachloride is being used to a considerable extent, and work in some of the welding plants, etc. It's a constant program as these occupational health hazards arise.

MR. BARKMAN: include the penicillin given to the needy, as before it went through the municipalities?

MR. WITNEY: No, we passed that item. That item goes back further in the estimates and I believe it comes under the --if I recall correctly, it comes under the Provincial Laboratory. I'm sorry, it comes under the item, Preventive Medical Services.

MR. BARKMAN: I'm sorry. Don't bother looking for it. All I was going to say, I wish they'd add insulin to that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (18) (a) --passed; (b) --passed; (19) (a) --passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have a brief rundown of these expenditures, Child and Maternal Grant --just a broad synopsis.

MR. WITNEY: It's on Page 14 of the Summary of Activities: Provides assistance in the organization of prenatal classes. The maintenance of a registry of Winnipeg school children who have major handicapping conditions. Employment of a director and three transfusion officers to provide a co-ordinated and uniform transfusion service to babies suffering from RH factor. Payment of salaries and expenses of seven staff members who are engaged in preventative dentistry. And then a study of following research on natal and neo-natal deaths, and the assessment of a very highly technical procedure of measuring the heart beats of children in the fetal stage, and then a study of maternal mortality, in order to reduce maternal loss.

MR. PAULLEY: this venture then, Mr. Chairman, it would be proper for us here in this Assembly to give due recognition to those doctors in the Province of Manitoba who are performing marvellous operations insofar as our children and babies are concerned. It is particularly with pride that we note persons here in medical science with the blood transfusions of babies yet unborn. We know, I'm sure, all the members of the committee know that this has

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). received considerable publicity all throughout the Dominion and other places as well, and I think that it is to the credit of the doctors that we have here in Manitoba that are concerned with child and infant care that they're making such tremendous progress. I know I as one, Mr. Chairman, quite frequently say things in this Assembly that may not be too flattering to the medical profession. In some instances at least I'm very very happy to be able to pay a compliment to the doctors who are working so hard in this very important field of medicine, and I'm sure that when I say this in this body, I'm in essence saying "thank you" to these doctors on behalf of the parents whose children have to undergo this type of surgery, blood transfusions and the like. We have nothing here in Manitoba to be ashamed of in many fields of medicine, and I would suggest that in the field of which I have just spoken we can do this with justifiable pride, and we owe to these doctors who are concerned in this particular field a debt of gratitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (19) (a)--passed; (b)--passed. Now, we'll go back to No. (7) at the bottom of Page 16.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder before we go back to that, the other evening I asked of the Honourable Minister copies of the various pamphlets and documents that his department issues. If you recall, he asked me whether I wanted the ones on prenatal and post-natal, and I asked him if he would give me the works. I'm happy this afternoon that the Honourable the Minister has caused to be laid upon the table or desk the flip chart dealing with the First Aid, and it appears to me a very educational chart. I suggest that it might be well for it to be placed in every home in the province. I note that there is the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Health's picture. With all due respect, that may be to the good, but anyway, seriously, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Minister is still going to make available the other documents as well so that we can see all that your department, Mr. Minister, is doing by way of informational bulletins.

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the department has been asked to send to both the Honourable the Leader of the NDP and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition the material that is available.

In answering some of the questions that I received the other night on this matter of hospitals, in the revenue from the Hospital Services tax, this item that is there for \$11.4 million, we estimate that the five points on the income tax will yield about \$5.6 million, and the one point on the corporation tax will mean about \$1.699 million; and the subsidy to the Hospital Commission which has been \$3 million up to this year will be increased correspondingly to \$4,000,121. The Professional Services that the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface was asking for --the professional services are a Consulting Architect, in round figures \$13,000; the Legal Consultant, Mr. Baird, \$5,000; medical consultants, \$9,000; and audit fees --the Comptroller-General fees and the audit fees for municipal agreements-- \$15,900; a survey that was made by Woods, Gordon and Company, \$7,300; and laundry consultants, \$4,400; which brings it up in roughly round figures to the \$55,000.00.

I was asked further for some information about the third party earnings for 1953 and what the two people were used for. In 1963, the recoveries on third party liability were, in round figures, 162,000; the total that was paid solicitors was 10,800; recovered by solicitors was 97,200; and recovered without assistance of solicitors, 65,163. I was asked how much of this was paid to Mr. Baird, and while I have not got the exact figure because of the difficulty in obtaining it during the time, I'm advised that it is about \$200.00 less than the figure given for 1964.

In the third party liability section, it consists of two persons, one who does all the stenographic work and acts as an assistant in collecting information, processing claims and all clerical work handled by the department. There are no records from January 1st, 1963 to July 1st, '63, but from July 1st, '63 to December 31st, '63, there were, in round figures, 1900 cases opened; from January 1st to December 31st there were 3700 cases opened. Each one had to be investigated to ascertain if third party might be involved; necessary correspondence drawn up; insurance companies, adjusters, solicitors advised of the commission interest; and followed up through the year on each of these cases until the money was received or there was proof that no third party recovery was forthcoming due to the circumstances of the case; and as of March 31st, 1965, the department had 1900 open cases in process of negotiation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed to the next item, I wonder if the Minister, if he's going to give this additional information to the other leaders whether he'd also provide another one for me. There's one other matter that I would like to mention, and

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....that has to do with a card. Apparently they have this available or are putting this out in Saskatchewan --a card to the individual on which they state the type of blood the person has, and in case he has an accident, or so if the patient is taken to hospital, they immediately know and don't have to make any further checks. Does he know about it, and if so are we contemplating anything in that line?

MR. WITNEY: There is a volunteer program operated by the Red Cross where they ask people to have a sticker on their car windshield which when there's an accident the RCMP see the sticker and then they are able to refer to a blue card on the victim's person which states the grouping. I have one here, and if any other members wish to have them they could appear at the Red Cross and the Red Cross will make the necessary arrangements.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what I want from the Minister, I wonder if he might have copies dealing with the financial aspect that he just referred to that we may have for our consideration. I noted that he mentioned something dealing with some figures dealing with third party recoveries. It seems to me, just listening to my honourable friend, that in respect to some of the recoveries the cost of recovering was quite a high percentage, percentage-wise, of the recovery; I wonder if my honourable friend may have copies of statements pertaining to that, also the statements that our friend gave us respecting the amount which has been raised by income tax and corporation tax. Rather than having to wait for Hansard, I think they might be better for us if we had them earlier.

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to verify some of these figures that I took down as the Minister read them off. I take it that when he gave us the figures for the income from the tax, that he was referring to the projected income for 1966. Is that correct? 1965-66. And the five percent personal income tax will bring in, it is expected, \$5.6 million?

MR. WITNEY: In round figures.

MR. MOLGAT: The one percent corporation tax, 1.699?

MR. WITNEY: Right.

MR. MOLGAT: So that gives us a total of 7.299, and then the provincial subsidy will be increased, did he say, from \$3 million?

MR. WITNEY: Yes. If you want the exact figures, the individual income, the five points, is \$5,606,000, the projected estimate; the corporation income is \$1,699,000, for a total of \$7,305,000; and then the subsidy will be increased from \$3 million to \$421,000 and if you add those figures up you'll get the \$11,426,000 in Item 7.

MR. MOLGAT:

MR. WITNEY: \$4,121,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.