

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 17, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

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 some 33 Grade 12 students from Beaver Brae School at Kenora, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Fraser. There are also some 60 Grade 11 students from Garden City School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Solar. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I'd like to speak for our group here, and speak for the Assembly if I may. I see someone here has put something here for St. Patrick's Day. Now I was a little forgetful on St. David's Day, but now I'll speak on St. Patrick's Day. I'll make myself an Irishman for today.

Now, as you know, St. Patrick came from Romanized Britain. He was what you call a Breton - a Celt - and I suppose like the average Celt he was very dramatic in his way and he could talk and he could do these things and he could wish the little people to come and help him and everything else that goes. So, somehow or other, St. Patrick - or Patrick as he was called at that time - was captured as a slave and taken over into Ireland, and he says, "By golly, there's a bunch of barbarians here. I've got to do something about them. I've got to convert them." So he started in. Well, he started in and he found out there was a lot of snakes there, so he said, "Kill all the snakes." Now there's no snakes in Ireland. That's a very funny thing. So after they killed all the snakes, they found out that there was a lot of baboons there, so he gave an order to kill the baboons. So by golly they went ahead and they made a count and they found out they were killing more Irishmen than they were killing baboons, so he quit.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health, and I apologize to him for not having given him notice but I believe it's a question of policy he can readily answer. I understand that the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission have carried on a survey and have made recommendations to the government in regard to ambulance service. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if it's his intention during the discussion of his estimates to table this recommendation or report.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): The answer, Madam Speaker, is yes. The report is in the printers, Madam Speaker, and I was advised yesterday that there was some problem and it should be up by the beginning of the week.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to just inform the House that three persons have been arrested and taken into custody in Vancouver and charged with theft of gold, which relates to a case which is of some current interest, and once again to express my admiration for the splendid work of the police services concerned. Chief Maltby of the St. James Police has told me that the work of the RCMP in this case was magnificent. That's pleasant to report, but I think it reflects great credit on all three forces concerned.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the statement that has just been made by the Attorney-General in connection with the famous gold case, and I join with him in congratulations to the law enforcing agencies of the Province of Manitoba and all of those who co-operated in this matter. This draws to my attention -- one question of the Attorney-General however. May I ask him that in view of his announcement that three more potential culprits have been apprehended, bail might be arranged, or is he considering the granting of bail to the lawyer, who I understand is still in custody.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, the Attorney-General does not grant bail. That matter is before the courts and I would not wish to make any comment other than to say that I presume it will be considered by the court in the regular way.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 1, dated February 7, 1966, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Will the government be introducing legislation at this Session with respect to the government policy announced in its estimates yesterday?

MR. WITNEY: No.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if I may have permission before the Orders are called, I had undertaken to produce the budget tomorrow. I'm afraid that it will not be available at that date. I'm hoping for early next week.

MR. PAULLEY: Apparently my honourable friend is having difficulty in raising money, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: It's not the problem of raising money, it's the problem of lowering the water.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 15 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, in view of the statement made by the Honourable the First Minister, are we going to receive a watered-down budget?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Public Works.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister is not in his chair, so could the matter stand until he is available.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between: (1) Mr. D. H. Bain, the D. H. Bain estate, and the Manitoba Government, re conservation, goose preserves and properties at Grant's Lake and Delta, since 1960. (2) The Manitoba Government solicitors Pitblado Hoskins and/or Mr. G. R. Hunter, and the Manitoba Government, re properties at Grant's Lake, Delta and Portage la Prairie owned by Mr. D. H. Bain and the D. H. Bain Estate since 1960. (3) The Manitoba Government and/or its solicitors, and any other parties not mentioned in (1) and (2) regarding the properties at Grant's Lake, Delta and Portage la Prairie.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, we would be happy to accept this Order subject to the usual reservations for privileged matters and confidential matters. My honourable friend will appreciate that Item 2 would fall under that category as was discussed in the debate on this matter, I believe it was around the 6th of May last year.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying for copies of: (1) All correspondence and agreements between the Government of Canada or any Department, Minister, Commission, Board, Agency or official thereof, and the Government of Manitoba or any Department, Minister, Commission, Board, Agency or official thereof, dealing with the so-called Winnipeg Floodway, the so-called Portage Diversion, and the so-called Shellmouth Reservoir. (2) All requests from the Government of Manitoba to the Government of Canada for permission to table these documents.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we are happy to accept the Order with the usual reservations that are customary in these cases.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying for: (1) Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Governments of Canada and Ontario, with regard to the possibility of establishing a national park in the southeast corner of Manitoba, adjoining the Lake of the Woods and the Northwest Angle. (2) Copies of any reports or studies on this area, pertaining to the above project. (3) Copies of all requests from the Government of Manitoba to the Governments of Canada and Ontario for permission to table the above documents.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, we're happy to accept this Order subject to the usual reservations as to confidentiality and to privilege and to concurrence from the other governments concerned. There is one further matter, if my honourable friend could give us some idea of the dates that he is concerned in otherwise it is necessary for the department to go back really to the beginning of time.

MR. TANCHAK: Since 1963 will be fine.

MR. LYON: Since 1963 - we'll accept it on that basis, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Did the number of motor vehicles traversing along P. T. H. No. 1 between the Perimeter Road and Portage la Prairie in 1965 exceed one million. (2) Did they exceed 1,500,000. (3) Did they exceed 1,400,000. (4) Did they exceed 1,300,000. (5) Did they exceed 1,200,000. (6) Did they exceed 1,100,000.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Highways, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that consideration of this Order be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Association for Retarded Children from 1963 to the present, dealing with -- (a) The National Crusade for Mental Retardates; and (b) regarding the proposal for a regional training and research centre for the handicapped in the Brandon area.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Member for St. Boniface, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The number of Boards, Commissions, Committees, Agencies established by the Government of Manitoba since 1958. (2) The name of each of these bodies. (3) The date on which they were established. (4) Which ones are still functioning and which have been dissolved. (5) The names and addresses of all members presently serving on each of the Boards, Committees and Agencies. (6) When the members were appointed and term of appointment. (7) The individual annual salaries, allowances and expenses of all these members. (8) The total annual cost of these Boards, Commissions, Committees and Agencies.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: Details of all offers to purchase made to owners of property in the Oak Lake Project area and the Pipestone Creek area, showing in particular: (a) the date the offer was made; (b) the amount offered; (c) the legal description and the location of the property; (d) the person or persons to whom the offer was made; and (e) whether the offer was verbal or written.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I just rise to say that it's subject to the reservation respecting any matters, if there are any, that are under negotiation at the present time.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing details of all offers to purchase made to owners of property in the Arts Centre area and in the redevelopment area south of the CPR line and east of Main St., by the Government of Manitoba or any of its agents, showing in particular: (a) the date the offer was made; (b) the amount offered; (c) the description of the property; (d) the person or persons to whom the offer was made; and (e) whether the offer was verbal or written.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we are happy to accept the question with the reservation respecting matters under negotiation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced each month at the Manitoba Hydro steam plant at Brandon, for each month since March, 1965, to date information is available. (2) The cost and amount of fuel burned each month at the above station during the above period. (3) The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced each month at the Manitoba Hydro steam plant at Selkirk, for each month since March, 1965, to date information is available. (4) The cost and amount of fuel burned each month at the above station during the above period. (5) The number of kilowatt hours of electricity purchased each month by Manitoba Hydro from outside the Province of Manitoba for each month since March, 1965, to date, stating from whom purchased and amount paid. (6) The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced each month at Grand Rapids generating station in 1965, and to date in 1966. (7) The anticipated number of kilowatt hours of electricity to be produced at Grand Rapids generating station during the remainder of 1966.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we are glad to accept the question, except Question No. 7. I doubt that it would be desirable to make the guess that my honourable friend asks for.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, is it not possible for the -- surely the Hydro officials are in a position to anticipate what that answer will be.

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. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may this item stand please?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, is it the intention of the government to proceed with that bill or drop it?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, members will recall that the suggestion was made from the other side that it would be helpful in the consideration of this bill if it could follow a consideration of provisions of The Highway Traffic Act which at that time were coming forward. That bill has now come forward; it's in committee. It would be my intention to speak on second reading next week on Bill No. 7.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 41. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, Bill 41 that is before us is an Act to amend The Elections Act, and while a committee report was made - I think a year ago - to this

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) House recommending certain changes, I for one was not a member of that committee at that time, and when the report came in I mentioned a number of items that I would like to see changed; and also matters that were not touched on, I also recommended some changes in some of those sections as well. In listening to the member, for Elmwood I think it was that spoke on it yesterday, I quite concur with what he had to say in connection with having two enumerators instead of the one. I think this would be of benefit in many a case. I definitely will have some amendments to offer in Law Amendments or in Committee of the Whole, whichever is the more proper one, and I will be offering some ideas at that stage.

However, there is also some matters not brought into the bill that I had hoped would come forward. One has to do with Section 37 (d) (2) and one is the matter of the \$200 deposit. I would like to see this reduced or eliminated entirely. Why should we have a penalty on democracy? I think the poor man who hasn't got the money should be entitled to run as a candidate and not have to put up the deposit. I think this is wrong. This is wrong in principle and we should change that. If it's not eliminated entirely, let's reduce it very substantially so that people who want to run as independents may do so and not have to pay out large sums of money. It's large in the sense that anyone who doesn't have the funds, they are large, regardless of what the amount may be. So this is a matter that I definitely intend to bring forward at the committee level - the committee stage, and I hope that members of this House will give it some consideration.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the members of this House the change in Form 35. I notice in the change of Form 35 that we will now be asked to name the candidate, the address of the candidate, and the occupation. I would like to see that, rather than give the address, let's eliminate the address and let us state the affiliation, the party affiliation. I think this is important. Certainly I have nothing to be ashamed of to be identified with the party, and I would think that other members likewise would not have any objection to be identified with any particular party. Certainly they shouldn't if they really believe in their party that they stand for, so that I would like to see this changed and to have party identification on the ballot.

Then there is another matter which I think is very important. Under the old Form 35, we read on Page 116 of The Elections Act, Chapter 68, and the various amended forms, so that brings it up to date, and I quote under the Form 35 in the first section the following quotation: "The names of the candidates alphabetically arranged in the order of their surnames with the address and occupation of each shall be printed on the ballot paper as close as possible to the margin." Now this speaks of an alphabetical arrangement, whereas in the new form there is no mention of it. The names can appear in different orders. We don't know - we couldn't even tell our people back home that our names will appear in alphabetical order and that such-and-such is the case. This has been eliminated. Why? I think it should be stated because we as a member should have a right to know where our names will appear on the ballot if we should seek to run again. So I think, whether this was by mistake or whether this is a sneaky way of eliminating it, I definitely feel that this should be brought back into the ballot and into Form 35 so that there would be no doubt on this matter whatever.

There are a few other matters such as the enumerator for hospitals. I think in the larger urban areas, in the cities, that where you have special enumerators for hospitals, that there should be a pay stated. Will they be paid at the same rate as those that go out and travel distances in rural constituencies? Here they can get a list from the hospital orderly, from the people in the office - in the administration - just ask for a list and they copy the list and that's it. That's all they will have to do, yet they will be receiving the same remuneration, I take it, as those that have to travel miles in the rural areas. I would like to know just what is the case. Will they be receiving the same pay? There is no distinction made as far as I can see it.

These are a few items that I thought I should bring to the attention of the House on the bill on second reading. I will have more items to touch on when we get to the committee stage.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if no other member wishes to speak, perhaps I might make just one or two comments respecting the views which have been expressed by the members who have participated in the debate on this bill, and I want to express my appreciation to them for their contributions.

Dealing with the various matters in the order in which they came before us in the debate, and referring to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in which he said that our provincial legislation should be similar to the federal legislation on elections and also similar to municipal

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) elections, all designed to encourage the largest number of persons to exercise their franchise. With that general view, I would certainly have no quarrel, and indeed many of the changes which are proposed by this bill are designed to bring our provincial election machinery more closely in line with that which is followed in respect of federal elections. This is a gradual process and of course there are practical matters that have to be faced and it isn't always possible to make them identical. I would have to confess that I think the committee did not give any consideration, as I recall it, to similarities with municipal election machinery, but undoubtedly that is a matter that certainly, as time goes by, will be considered.

On the topic of two enumerators in various polls, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said there ought to be two enumerators in urban polls, and he was supported in that view by the Honourable the Member for Elmwood and now by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. I perhaps am unable at this time to accept the reasoning which the honourable members have advanced for two enumerators, and I would remind the members that in the case of federal elections in which there are two enumerators, it's rather curious that that in itself has not and never has eliminated errors in the composition or the making of the electors' rolls in federal elections. In fact I was thinking about it, and in my own experience of some 20 years, which includes both federal elections and provincial elections, I'd be inclined to think that we have had more names left off in federal elections than we have in provincial elections, even though they have had two enumerators in certain instances under that Act.

What I am really saying, Madam Speaker, is that I don't think that the fact of two enumerators is any more a guarantee of ensuring that everyone's name is on the list than is one. I don't believe that the idea has perhaps the merit which is claimed for it. What I think is much more important, because enumerators being human, errors will continue to be made no matter how you go at it. What I think is much more important are some of the proposed changes in the bill which is before the members and which enables errors, once made, to be corrected as easily as possible, and names omitted to be added to the list and full opportunity given for voting, and that perhaps is getting at the essential problem that exists and the cure of it.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said he was perplexed by the final section of the bill which brings one portion into effect on proclamation and the other on Royal Assent. I indicated that the provision to which reference is made is one which is a companion feature to a proposal which will be coming before the members by way of amendments to The Liquor Act, and I think that we have drafted this bill in the manner which we have in order that there will be no problem as between this bill and The Liquor Act, assuming that The Liquor Act amendment in question receives the approval of the House.

I have mentioned the matter of enumerators which was raised by the Honourable Member from Elmwood and also by the Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Rhineland refers to the deposit and that is a fair observation. I myself do not believe that the deposit feature has prevented anyone from being a candidate. There are some advantages in retaining it and I think it is a matter which we ought not to abandon too quickly or perhaps without some very careful consideration.

With respect to the form of the ballot stating the political affiliation of the candidates, here again I would be inclined to think that we ought not to change what has been the tradition so far as our own province is concerned and our federal election machinery without some careful consideration, because after all, even though we have political affiliations, the electors vote for a representative - presumably they are primarily interested in their representative in the Legislative Assembly in this instance perhaps more than the political party to which that person may belong.

I think there is nothing sneaky, if I might use the word used by the Honourable Member from Rhineland, about the wording in the Form 35 to which he made reference. The governing factor is what the section of the Act says on this particular point and that has not been changed, so that it remains the same and the law would be the law as it is stated in the relevant section or section of the Act, not as indicated on the form which is of an explanatory nature only.

I think I would have no further comment, Madam Speaker, but to again commend the measure to the members of the House.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, could the Minister tell me what section he is referring to, because I have checked the Act and I don't find any particular section dealing with the matter of alphabetical arrangement. It's just contained on the form.

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

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 50, an Act to amend The Plant Pests and Diseases Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: The principle of the bill is to give the department the authority to require a municipality to undertake programs and measures prescribed in regulations under the Act which may be necessary in combating an invasion of - or the incidence of Dutch Elm disease within that municipality; and the other matter of principle in the bill is to provide authority for the government to give financial assistance to the municipality in carrying out the programs that may be required.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): I do not rise to oppose the bill on second reading, but it seems to me in referring to the policy of this bill, it mentions that a Minister may require a municipality at the expense of the municipality to implement the necessary measures to control the Dutch Elm disease. I'm just wondering - I don't see why this government would wish to take the authority or even what right it has to tell a municipality to take action, or whatever measures they may be, without accepting financial responsibility. I know in the bill later on it goes on to say that they may accept financial responsibility. Also, if a municipality may be required to take action, are there any plans for assistance by this government if the Minister should wish to call this? Would the Minister mind elaborating on this?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: I was just wondering whether somebody was going to get up at the nth moment and continue the debate. We haven't got a specific program mapped out but we do know this much, that if Dutch Elm disease occurs and is diagnosed any place in Manitoba, we will have to undertake a very careful sanitary procedure, that is reconnaissance, identification of the disease, and sanitary measures to remove and destroy any diseased material. The reason for the government taking the power to require a municipality to undertake preventative measures is that if we should get Dutch Elm disease in Manitoba, somebody has to take the responsibility to see that it is dealt with, because if a municipality should take less than a firm position in dealing with it, their behaviour or their method of handling it would endanger the trees in other municipalities in the Province.

Now I know that the Act doesn't say that we shall undertake financial assistance to the municipalities, but I think the very fact that we are introducing these amendments and we are providing here for agreements that can be entered into between the province and the municipalities in providing for the expenditure of monies from the Consolidated Fund to assist in any program that might be required, is a pretty good indication that the province will take its responsibility here and will give the financial assistance that is required to help the municipalities to keep this disease out of Manitoba.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the second reading of Bill No. 53. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) presented Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, back in 1958 when the Hospital Plan came in, we had the very peculiar situation where elderly persons on a minimum income became the full responsibility of government when they required hospital services, but the moment they recovered to the point where they could be discharged from hospital and might still require care, either skilled nursing care or other kinds of care, they ceased to become a government responsibility and had to rely to a large extent on their own resources. Services at that time were provided largely by proprietary nursing homes of which there were a great number in the Province of Manitoba, most of which were old converted residential homes that had been put to this particular use and many of them were not well suited for the care of elderly and infirmed citizens.

The government at that time had not accepted responsibility for financial assistance, health services, accommodation or care, and the municipalities had only done so to a very limited extent. The 1956 Elderly Persons Housing Act provided financial assistance to various kinds of accommodation, but there was very little service given in helping to determine the needs of municipalities for this kind of accommodation. There was no attempt to relate the accommodations or the kinds of services, either within that community or within the general

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) area; and no effort had been made at that time with respect to alternate care of patients, either in their own homes, in the home of relatives, or in foster home accommodation; and there was very little use or practically no use of such things as home-maker services, visiting nurses and some of the newer programs like meals on wheels.

In 1959, at the time of the passing of the amended Elderly Persons Housing Act, we had accommodation within the province for 1,000 people in nursing homes, in various municipal, religious and voluntary accommodations. We had room for another 1,701 of this number, 877 had been built under the 1956 Elderly Persons Housing Act which resulted in about 300 new accommodations per year during that time.

Since 1959 we've had an increase in accommodation of over 4,500 new places representing a total investment of \$9.6 million in some 82 projects scattered throughout the province. During this same period of time there has been a vast expansion in health services and new concepts in caring for elderly citizens. Efforts have been made to maintain the independence of our elderly to an extent that was never possible in the past and we've had tremendous co-operation from doctors, from hospitals, from various health and welfare agencies, the public at large, and many community organizations among which I would like to mention the Age and Opportunity Bureau, the Community Welfare Planning Council and all of those who support these projects; also, the various day centres - Notre Dame and the new one, the North End Day Centre - and the various service clubs who have been active in sponsoring facilities of these kind.

The care services organization, the joint Health-Welfare Agency together with our Director of Elderly Persons Housing have been working towards a total and comprehensive program for elderly citizens. We find that good housing helps to preserve the physical and mental independence of elderly people through enabling them to move about freely; it frees them from the fear of loneliness; enables them to take advantage of many of the extra aids that are provided in these projects to assist frail elderly people and people with physical deficiencies of various kinds. We also feel that the home-help program has been of substantial assistance in helping to maintain people in their own accommodation - their own homes.

To continue to progress in the field of elderly persons housing in co-operation with the very enthusiastic response of sponsors throughout the province, we've decided to amend the Act, the form of the grant, to enable the province to pay out in some cases grants on an annual interest and principal basis over the lifetime of the project rather than in a lump sum grant during the various stages of construction. There will be an accelerated program to meet the growing needs, and in particular the need for new personal care homes and the replacing of many of the old inadequate facilities that we have today.

Under the new policy that is being established during the coming year, we expect that there'll be some 23 new projects started. The total investment is estimated to be \$9.2 million. It represents an investment of 337 new housing units, 110 new hostel units, and 685 personal care accommodations, some of which are new and some of which will be a replacement of old accommodations. We believe that this is a step forward in the field of elderly persons housing and we would recommend this bill to the House.

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

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 62, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, it must have been an Irishman who was responsible for this bit of homely philosophy, that there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us, it ill behooves any of us to find fault with the rest of us. The object of the provisions of the amendments to The Employment Standards Act is to make provision for the same standards throughout the province relating to hours of work and the payment of overtime.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister if this means that he assumes - or his department assumes full responsibility for all prosecutions in connection with the items which he mentioned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker was your motion not put a little hastily, because I understood there was a question directed to the Honourable Minister of Labour and we certainly anticipated an answer.

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes what?

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes is the answer.

MADAM SPEAKER: I understood he gave it to him by a nod of his head.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I move, seconded by the Honourable the 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. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Health a question, or several questions in reference to the proposed building of the Children's Hospital. I have on previous occasions requested information before the Orders of the Day as to the status of the plans and construction of the Children's Hospital. Now the other day the Minister gave us the understanding that the green light was given and that the plans for the construction of this hospital were under way. Now I find that this is not the complete situation as it exists at the present time. The news that appeared in the local papers, both in the Tribune and in the Free Press, at best are rather confusing, and there appears to be a conflict in the outline of the plans and the details which we have been led to believe have been completed or on the verge of being completed.

Further, Mr. Chairman, there is unnecessary delay in connection with this project and this is creating a great deal of concern and frustration on the part of the staff and management of the Children's Hospital. There is no question about the children requiring the necessary care in this institution, and they are not properly attended to at the present time.

Now the question I have, Mr. Chairman, that if the Department of Health by virtue of the Honourable Minister is unable to provide the proper and necessary care for the construction of this hospital, then the question is, what do you propose to do? I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that this project was on the boards and had the green light since 1958. That is some eight years ago and there has been no action followed up. And I might draw to the attention of the Honourable Minister that every year we are given the optimistic approach that this project is going to get under way and we forget what we have said the year before when the next year comes around.

Now if the people who contribute to the hospitalization of this province and those who failed to pay for this hospitalization are liable to be hauled up in court and be prosecuted, then I think it's high time that the taxpayers of our province who cannot get accommodation in the Children's Hospital should be granted the same privilege to take action against the Minister and his department and have the same type of privilege in the eyes of the law that they have when they contravene or break the law. I think that the Department of Health is equally as guilty for delaying the construction program of the Children's Hospital.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Stage One got under way on April 21, 1958, and in June 26, 1958, the planning committee authorized discussion with the architects in the development and possible preparation of the schedule. Now bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that this is June 26, 1958. Now we have the Hospital Commission on Thursday, March 10, 1966, coming out that the Children's Hospital is getting the green light, and the Chairman of the Commission is saying this - talking about the proposed construction plan - "After this next stage, we will sit down with the hospital and review their proposed operating budget for the new building to make sure we don't get an inexpensive facility that would cost too much to run," said Mr. Holland.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I want to bring to the attention of this committee is that this green light has been on since June, 1958, and I intend to go bit by bit, Mr. Chairman, to bring to the attention of this committee just how this project has been delayed, and I still cannot understand if this has been done intentionally or otherwise. Now the Minister surely is in charge of his department and he is the only man that can put pressure or find out what it is that is delaying the construction of this most valuable service that the community requires.

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.)

Now on August 26, 1958, a meeting was authorized for the preparation of plans for apartments for married interns in connection with the extension of the hospital. The later on September 10, 1958, the planning committee authorized discussion with the government, September 30, 1958 - a meeting was held with the Psychiatric Service Committee regarding needs for additional psychiatric services for the Children's Hospital and request the Children's Hospital to provide same, and a letter went out on October 31, 1958. October 3, 1958 - a meeting with Dr. Elliott, Deputy Minister of Health, to outline the Children's Hospital thinking regarding its future development. October 9, 1958 - a letter from Mr. Robinson to follow this discussion outlining in writing our proposals.

Then on January 14, 1959, the expansion proposals were presented to the planning committee and then circulated to the board and medical staff of the Children's Hospital. January to June, 1959, or a period of six months, comments and proposals were obtained from the various medical staff and the department heads who were connected with the Children's Hospital. On March 9, 1959, a medical staff building committee was constituted. Then on October, 1959, the Manitoba Government set up the Willard Commission to study the hospital facilities in the province, and at this point, after the Children's Hospital had made a great deal of studies and had gone to a great deal of expense in order to get the proper type of accommodation and the proper type of a building that they required, then all this was suspended because of the Willard Commission.

Then on November 24, 1959, the preliminary report of the building committee of the medical staff was presented to the planning committee. Then on May 3, 1960, written presentations were made to the Willard Committee. On June 12, 1960, the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board visited the Children's Hospital. Then on March 23, 1961, the report of the Hospital Survey Board was received. Then on April 28, 1961, Mr. Robinson of the Children's Hospital requested a meeting with the government to discuss the recommendations of this report. On May 23, 1961, the hospital received a reply from Dr. Johnson deferring the meeting.

Then on January 22, 1962 - and we are now four years from the date of the so-called initial green light that was given by this government - then a letter was received from Dr. Johnson stating that the government proposed to make grants available to the Children's Hospital. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to specifically relate this to the Honourable Minister, that Dr. Johnson, the then Honourable Minister of Health, stating that the government proposed to make grants available to the Children's Hospital to provide 100 medical and surgical beds and 16 psychiatric beds in 1964-65, 1965-66, and 1966-67, and 1967-68. Today we have it as 1966 and there is still no definite program under way.

Now on February 12, 1962, a meeting was held with the government re financing and implementation of the Survey Board recommendations. On March 19, 1962, an expansion planning committee composed of members of the Board of Directors and medical staff was constituted by the Board of Directors of the Children's Hospital. Then discussions were undertaken with Brakeley and Co. regarding a survey to judge the success of a fund-raising campaign which was under way on November, 1959, and this was based partially on the letter from Dr. Johnson in reference to the grants, so that the Children's Hospital had to put up some of their own money.

Now these discussions for the raising of additional money were again reopened on March 14, 1962, when a representation from the firm met with the building committee and plans were under way. In March 27, 1962, the same firm was engaged to do a fund-raising survey. May 28, 1962 - the expansion planning committee commenced their meetings. On June 13, 1962, applications for hospital consultants were called and these were appointed on July 6, 1962. In August, 1962, the report from the survey for raising funds was completed and received by the Children's Hospital and the department heads of the Children's Hospital were all consulted in order to make certain that the proposed space and accommodation was sufficient for their planning of the new Children's Hospital.

Now In September of 1962, Hamilton and associates were interviewed and asked to help with the preparation of the architectural program. Now, Mr. Chairman, this was done specifically at the request or suggestion of the then Minister of Health. This was a further delay in some of the detailed planning of this project which had been completed at an earlier date, but the request was made to change these plans.

Then in September of 1962, a letter was written to Dr. Johnson advancing a proposal for borrowing the 20 percent of capital cost. As I understand it, the Children's Hospital was quite prepared, able and capable to raise this 20 percent of the capital cost. Then a meeting was

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.) held with Dr. Johnson and in January of 1963 it was felt that this discussion should also be held with the Mayors and Reeves Association in order to make them fully aware of the need of a Children's Hospital and also bringing to their attention that they too might properly contribute something in the way of the capital cost towards the 20 percent requirement. Then in March, 1963, further meetings were held in order to carry on a joint fund-raising campaign in order to spread it over as large a public as they could and in order to get as much of a support for this project as they could.

In June, 1963, negotiations were undertaken with the Manitoba Hospital Commission and with the Grace Hospital re the provision of pediatric beds in the new Grace Hospital. Then in June, 1963, Mr. Trimble of Moody and Moore and James Hamilton and Associates met with the Hospital Commission to try and finalize the type of construction that they were going to undertake. And again, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to your attention that this was in June, 1963, some two and a half to almost three years ago.

Now in August, 1963, the architectural program was completed. December 2, 1963 - a reply was received from the Mayors and Reeves Association in reference to the fund-raising for the 20 percent of capital costs. Then in April, 1964, a special committee on finance was appointed by the Executive Committee of the Children's Hospital, and these people were ready, able and prepared to put up their share of the 20 percent of the capital cost. And in reading these remarks into the record, Mr. Chairman, there was always a delay created by the Department of Health.

Now in May of 1964, a functional program of drawings was submitted to the Manitoba Hospital Commission and yet, Mr. Chairman, as late as March, 1966, with the green light being given, there are still many unanswered questions. One that I would like to mention at this particular time is the matter of flexibility, and this is centred, as I understand it, as to whether the rooms in this new proposed building should have accommodation for two beds or two cribs. As I understand the word "flexibility", it is highly desirable to have the rooms large enough to accommodate two beds, and then if cribs are required, you can remove these beds and replace them with cribs. As I understand it, the Hospital Commission doesn't want to go along with this type of thinking. They would like to have certain rooms that are fixed for the accommodation of standard beds and certain rooms that are fixed for the accommodation of cribs only, and when you analyze this difference between the Hospital Commission and the planning group of the Children's Hospital, it means that the crib room is 18 inches shorter than a standard two-bed room.

Now, Mr. Chairman, surely - surely this is of very little concern in reference to this project. Why - why is the Department of Health, through the Manitoba Hospital Commission, finding fault with a difference of 18 inches in the construction of bedroom accommodation in a hospital when the staff, the experts, the consultants, tell us that they should have this flexibility. This apparently, Mr. Chairman, has been quite a large bone of contention. I interpret this to be nothing more than simply unexplained delay by the Department of Health. The Honourable Minister can tell us all he wants about the fact that the green light has been given, but it is far from having been given, and I would strongly suggest to the Honourable Minister that he take a personal interest in this matter and get this program on the road because there is no valid reason why this program is being delayed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I again want to carry on with the year 1964 - and this is August, 1964 - a letter from Mr. Pickering to Mrs. Richards referring to several matters for policy decisions such as the possible location of the pediatric beds in community general hospitals. Then in September and October we have requests from the Hospital Commission that the hospital give up its laundry and participate in the central laundry. Now again I point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is in the fall of 1964. If this isn't detailed planning, if this is not the discussion of detailed planning, I don't know what it is. And again I say that in the press release we are led to believe that there is still many unplanned sections of this proposed Children's Hospital.

Then on October 5, 1964, we again have a letter from Mr. Pickering regarding the proposals to establish an intermediate psychiatric unit at the Children's Hospital. And later on, Mr. Chairman, there was so much discussion about it and there was so much held up in terms of the planning of this project because of this one condition as to whether they should or should not have a psychiatric unit for children in a children's hospital. Then on October 14, 1964, a request from the chairman of the expansion planning, Mr. Alexander to the Hospital Commission for a meeting to clarify a number of aspects of the expansion - in the fall of 1964. Two

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.) years later, this clarification has still failed to come forward.

Now there were a series of discussions and letters between the Children's Hospital and Mr. Pickering in reference to the approval of the proposed building, in reference to the proposal of whether or not the new construction was really in accordance with the most efficient type of a hospital. Mr. Chairman, the Children's Hospital is being operated and conducted by one of the most excellent staffs and management in the Dominion of Canada, and I think that they are more competent and are more aware of what they are doing than any other member on the Hospital Commission that we have in Manitoba, and when the Chairman of the then Manitoba Hospital Association, Mr. Pickering, had discussed these matters in detail with the people that were on the Children's Hospital, I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that they were able to resolve and come to a satisfactory conclusion as to what was required by the Children's Hospital.

And so we have it, Mr. Chairman, and I can go on and read right through 1965 until September 22, 1965, when there was again a series of meetings held with the staff of the Children's Hospital and the Manitoba Hospital Commission to make an attempt at this late date to reduce the cost of the expanded program which the hospital was planning, and as I understand it, even at this late date, the people who are in charge of the Children's Hospital feel this expansion program should cost \$7.2 million, and they are being told that this should only cost them \$6.2 million and that they should go back and keep reviewing these plans once more to see if they can't fit this into a proposed cost of \$6.2 million, and one of those proposed items on which they should cut is to make the bedrooms a little smaller. Mr. Chairman, this is not the area in which you should save money, especially when this entails something like around 16 or 18 percent of the total project. This is completely unfair to the staff and the committee, or directors of the Children's Hospital.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister just what is the reason for this delay, because there is a definite delay in this program. The situation at the Children's Hospital is now beginning to be very critical and further delays can not be tolerated by the Children's Hospital. The staff and the various groups, the Women's Guild, the members of these guilds who are contributing much of their free time are most anxious for action. The Department of Health or the Hospital Commission, or both of these, have been dragging their feet in reference to this project.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to draw the attention of the committee to two things. In our estimates that we have before us, I do not see any item in connection with money made available for research, and I only want to draw to the attention of this committee, to tell you just how important and the amount of work that is being done by voluntary help such as the guilds in order to make this one aspect of research a very important contribution to this hospital. And I only bring this to the attention of the committee to again point out that this department is being completely unfair, and especially -- and I must say that this is the -- and I have to include that the Roblin Government in its hospital policy is being completely unfair to the proposed expansion and construction of the Children's Hospital. You take in 1965, and since 1959, the Children's Hospital of Winnipeg has received some \$282,000 which has been contributed by the guild donations that are made up of the Annie Bond Guild, the Chown Guild, Melvin Wood Guild, the McKinnon Guild, St. Agnes Guild, St. John's Guild, and the book market, and to this we must also add that at this important Children's Hospital we have some \$273,000 of a Research Grant provided to one of the doctors by the United States Public Health Service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason I mention this is that there is a very very wide segment of our community, especially among the ladies and the women's guilds of this community, that are dedicated and are conscientiously and most sincerely working for the good of the Children's Hospital. Now it is important to retain their goodwill. It is important to honour and acknowledge the good work that they are doing, and are we going to acknowledge it by this delaying of construction plans? Are we going to acknowledge it as a recognition by the frustration which we are imposing on the Children's Hospital operations? I think that this government stands to be condemned for not taking the proper action for the last eight years, and I don't care how you talk your way out of it - you can't. There has been purposeful delay; there has been unnecessary delay in connection with this project.

I would like to have the Honourable Minister tell us, without going to the release in the newspapers, without telling us that it is a green light, let's get all this window dressing out of the way; let's stop trying to defend the position of the government by means of the news media,

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.) the radio and television, that your action and the action of the Manitoba Hospital Commission is justified when it is not; and let us get on with the construction of this program. If the Children's Hospital on the best available authority has come forward with a program of \$7.2 million, I don't think that the Hospital Commission nor the Roblin administration nor the Department of Health is in a position to challenge that decision and say to them that you must make your rooms some 18 inches shorter and let us save and try and make this construction program come to \$6.2 million. I would very much appreciate if the Honourable Minister would give us the answers to these questions which have not been forthcoming for some eight years since the initial planning got under way. I would like to have an answer to that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I first of all, on behalf of the group I have the honour to lead, extend our best wishes to the staff and all who toil in the interests of health in the Province of Manitoba. I think that I can say without equivocation that by and large the people of Manitoba are well served by the staff of the Department of Health. We realize quite fully that in many areas of human endeavour we find frustrations from time to time, but we trust and pray that with continued effort these will be overcome. May I compliment the Minister on the introduction of his estimates last evening, and it will be my purpose this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, for a moment or two to discuss the formal statement that the Minister made in respect of health services and medical services insurance, and also to make a comment or two in respect of another vital important matter in Manitoba, namely, the question of our retardates in our province.

May I say at the offset, Mr. Chairman, that I think that the statement of the Minister truly reflects the attitude of the Roblin administration toward the provision of adequate health services for the people of the province. When I say that this statement truly reflects the attitude of government, I mean that the Government of Manitoba placed the health of the people of the province in categories far below others that may be more attractive to voters in some respects and to the psychology of the members opposite.

I trust you will forgive me, Mr. Chairman, if I stay rather closely to the statements made by the Minister, because I think that it contains some pertinent information as to the attitude of the Roblin Government. I start, Mr. Chairman, with this statement. "Education is one of the first priorities in this connection, but the preservation of the health of the population is also of prime concern to society, for the seeds of education only attain full fruition in a healthy people."

This is so true, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to quote from the Hall Commission report regarding this matter. I think in this quotation from the Hall report is the reflection of the Provincial Government of Manitoba, and I quote from the Hall Commission report. "It is said and accepted that our citizens are Canada's greatest asset. The intense concern about education and the magnitude of the expenditures being projected into the field of education at all levels are a realistic recognition of that fact, but education by itself will not give Canada the citizens it must have to achieve the goals that this country is capable of attaining, not only for its own citizens but for humanity at large. The citizens must not only be educated, but they must have healthy bodies, both physically and mentally, otherwise much of the vast sum spent on education will not bring the rewards in human well-being and national prosperity which our expenditures are aimed to achieve."

This is so true, Mr. Chairman, and I'm glad that the Minister made some passing reference to it.

But then in the next sentence or so my friend the Minister states what the position of government should be. "The Government of Manitoba is providing extensive and expanding programs in the field of health services in order to assist the individual in exercising his responsibility to maintain his own health and that of his family." This, Mr. Chairman, I think is the psychology of this government, the typical free enterprise approach that it is the individual that has to be assisted in the field so important of health, with the government leading the way.

"The Government of Manitoba," my friend's statement says, "maintains that medical service insurance should be available to all residents of Manitoba at a cost within their means." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend that the Government of Manitoba should simply say that all of the benefits of medical service should be available to all of the residents on the basis of ability to pay, but no one who hasn't the ability to pay should be deprived of all the benefits. The Minister's statement says that studies have shown approximately 25 percent of the population of Manitoba presently remain uncovered by any form of services of a medical

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) insurance nature. It states that it's also become apparent that of the 75 who have some form of medical services insurance coverage, a goodly number do not have adequate coverage, and it says that it is also estimated that an appreciable number find it difficult to meet the costs of average coverage.

Then the government goes on in the statement to say, Mr. Chairman, "From these studies we are convinced that better arrangements than we have at present are matters of public concern and we need such better arrangements at the earliest possible moment." This government, Mr. Chairman, was first elected in 1958, and what the Minister states in that sentence was just as true then as it is today in 1966. We need much better arrangements at the earliest possible moment. And my friend the Minister does not give us in his statements, in my opinion, a firm commitment of what government intends to do to bring about better arrangements insofar as the provision of medical care to the people of the province.

My honourable friend has said in his statement on the second page: "Directly arising from the principle of freedom from disease and freedom from the fear of disease is equal to freedom from other basic wants." My friend says directly arising from this was the Manitoba Medicare Plan available to citizens to whom The Social Allowances Act applies. This plan, my friend stated, provides the full range of personal health services and is presently costing approximately \$2 million a year. Then he goes on to state that as a result and according to their needs, citizens under Manitoba Medicare have been receiving medical services, dental service, dentures, etcetera. Is it true, Mr. Chairman? I wonder if my honourable friend is really aware of the qualifications to obtain the Medicare that he talks about in his statement. I wonder if he really knows what the situation is; what is the basis of this ability to pay. I think he should talk to the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, and I am sure that if he did he would get a far different idea of what is construed by government as to the ability to pay.

I have in my hand, Mr. Chairman, a letter that I wrote - a reply that I got to a letter I wrote on behalf of a citizen of Manitoba whose sole income was \$75.00 a month; a man on pension and that was his total pension. I made a request on this gentleman's behalf for a Medicare card. I felt that surely this government who looked after our people who require medical attention, that there would be no question of doubt that a person in our province whose sole income was \$75.00 a month would be entitled to a Medicare card. And what was the reply, Mr. Chairman? I read from the letter: "Dear Mr. Paulley: I would like to acknowledge your letter of December 28th. As requested, I have looked into this case and I am now pleased to clarify the matter for you. In assessing Mr. X's eligibility for Medicare benefits, the only income which is taken into account is his \$75.00 per month Old Age Security Pension. His budget has been worked out according to the regulations of The Social Allowance Act as follows: Expenses: Rent \$25.00; utilities \$2.50; food \$25.00; clothing \$5.00; household and personal \$10.00 - a sum total of \$67.50. Income: Old Age Security, \$75.00." Then he goes on to say that Mr. X's drug requirements appear to be negligible, for he had virtually no expenses of this nature during the past year. Because his estimated monthly expenses are below his monthly income he is not eligible on the basis of need, at the present time, for Medicare benefits. This is 1966. We're living in an affluent society, and yet the Department of Welfare has the consummate gall to say that a person who has an income of \$67.50 does not require a Medicare card? They say that he only requires \$67.50. Because he gets \$75.00 he's got \$7.50 to the good. This big-hearted government that goes to the people year after year and says, "Re-elect us; help us to help you," considers \$67.50 as being sufficient. I beg you

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification, if the man had been getting

.....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am making this speech.

MR. CARROLL: On a point of privilege then, on a point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: What's the privilege?

MR. CARROLL: The privilege is this: You say that I said that

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't even mention your name.

MR. CARROLL: All right. You said that if a person was getting \$67.00 a month, he wouldn't need Medicare. That's wrong. If he were only getting \$67.00 he'd have got Medicare. But he was getting \$75.00 and that was the difference. Between the \$67 and the \$75 was sufficient to cover his medical costs at that time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Honourable Minister of Welfare keep in his seat because, if he persists in this, I will reveal more of the attitude of this government. He says that I said that \$67.50 is sufficient. This is what this letter said. This letter

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) says, "Because you've got more than \$7.50, you don't require a Medicare card. Because you haven't needed drugs over a period of a year, we won't give you a Medicare card." This is what that letter says.

MR. CARROLL: What does the rest of the letter say?

MR. PAULLEY: Read it all? "I trust the above information will be satisfactory." I say to you, Mr. Chairman, I say to the people of Manitoba, it's not satisfactory. I say that despite, despite my honourable little friend, this government is failing the people of Manitoba in respect of Medicare. What does my honourable friend the Minister of Health, or the Minister of Welfare, want people to do? Does he actually want them to become medically indigent before they are granted aid? I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how long would \$7.50 last if a man had to get medication? Many of our pills cost 20, 25 cents apiece today. A doctor who attends a person at his home is entitled to a \$4.00 or \$5.00 charge for that service. How long would the \$7.50 last? Mr. Chairman, it doesn't even -- the \$7.50 wouldn't even provide for a trip to the dentist to get a tooth filled. And yet my honourable friend, the Minister of Welfare -- and I presume aided and abetted by the Minister of Health -- says this is sufficient.

MR. CARROLL: We don't say that.

MR. PAULLEY: You don't? You did. You certainly did.

MR. CARROLL: We normally say

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend

MR. CARROLL: You're putting words in our mouth. We don't say that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am putting no words in his mouth. I am reading from a letter from the department. On the basis of need, what is the basis of need? According to a good interpretation of this, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest a man would have to be practically on his deathbed before that administration there would make provisions for Medicare.

MR. CARROLL: You know that's not right. It's wrong.

MR. PAULLEY: You know it is. -- (Interjection) -- And, Mr. Chairman, I think that the attitude of some of the members opposite, with their tittering, is indicative of the attitude of that government to Medicare. This is no laughing matter. The Honourable Member from Birtle with his interjections -- Roblin, excuse me -- from Roblin, with his interjections. I note, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable gentleman has stated that he is not going to run in the next election. I say to you, it's a gol'darn good job you're not, because if it was, I'd challenge you to a debate in any town you chose to as to the type of government that you supported.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I'll still accept that challenge in the next campaign as a speaker in any town, in Roblin.

MR. PAULLEY: I want you as the candidate.

MR. ALEXANDER: Are you backing down now?

. continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: Again, back to the statement. This principle embodies the principle that freedom from disease and freedom from the fear of disease - on a surplus of \$7.50 a month - is equal to the fear of freedom for other basic wants. The article, as I state, Mr. Chairman, goes on: "As a result, and according to their needs, citizens have been receiving aid. Patients are free to choose their physician." And I think, Mr. Chairman, at the bottom of Page 2, we get the typical and the right attitude of the Government when he states, "All this has been done on the basis of need insuring that the public tax dollar went to the person who needed it most." The person whose sole income without any other assets or resources is \$75.00 a month. What a situation in Manitoba!

Then my friend the Minister goes on in his statement to list the recommendations of the Province of Manitoba to the Royal Commission on Health Services in January of 1962. One of its recommendations, my friend says, to the Royal Commission was that a comprehensive pre-paid medical coverage be made available to all citizens of Manitoba on a voluntary basis. A voluntary basis of \$7.50 a month. Surplus over \$67.50. Good night!

Then the Royal Commission made its report and the comment of the Honourable the Minister of Health states after listing the conditions, the principles enunciated by the Federal Government, dealing with the scope of the benefits, the coverage, public administration and transferability of benefits, my friend's statement goes on to say: "The Province would prefer a plan which depends on voluntary enrollment. We believe a voluntary plan, based on the individual exercising his responsibility to maintain his own health and that of his family, can be formulated at a cost to the individual within the reach of the majority of our people." If this is the principle of Government, why is it that we have a compulsory hospitalization scheme in the Province of Manitoba? Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time the Committee on Highway Safety is considering the compulsory use of helmets for the drivers of motorcycles? Or is this a horse of a different colour? Is it all right for the Government to enact and to recommend compulsory use of helmets for the drivers of motorcycles and then turn around and say that in the provision of health it should be voluntary?

I think my honourable friend had better change his attitude and his outlook, because Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the Minister of Health says that the Province of Manitoba is attempting to change the announced conditions or principles of the Federal Government, because he says this, and I quote: "For those who could not meet the cost, public assistance with all or part of the cost would be available." It's not available now, Mr. Chairman. Further, I quote: "Such a plan we believe could be successful in covering nearly all our people. Such a plan should be eligible for federal financial assistance, and we are negotiating toward this end." I say, Mr. Chairman, and I hope he can hear me in this, I say to Mike Pearson, don't let this penny-pinching, chiselling Conservative Government in the field of health change that principle! Don't listen to the Government of Manitoba in the field of health insurance when they want to continue the same type of coverage that they have at the present time.

Then my friend comes on with another statement. He states that it is clear, however, that the plan eventually adopted will not work without the co-operation of the medical profession itself. I say this is I'm convinced, Mr. Chairman, that a publicly-operated insurance scheme will receive the co-operation of the medical profession. Oh, I would say that the Canadian Medical Association and the Manitoba Medical Association will try to throw up road-blocks for a little while as they did in Saskatchewan. You remember, Mr. Chairman, when in Saskatchewan endeavours were being made to establish a medicare scheme there, we were told here the doctors would leave the province and wouldn't be back under their socialized medicine program. We were told how this would be to the detriment of the citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan and the doctors wouldn't go there. What is the situation, Mr. Chairman? It is true that at the time of the so-called strike or withdrawal of services of the medical profession in Saskatchewan, there was a reduction in the number of physicians practising there, but Mr. Chairman, the situation is, according to the last report I've got of the Medical Care Insurance Commission of Saskatchewan for the year 1964, that they have the greatest number of doctors that they have ever had in the Province of Saskatchewan practising under what? Under a compulsory medicare scheme in the Province of Saskatchewan.

So I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Health, I don't think he need worry too much about the co-operation of the medical profession. I am sure that the medical profession will carry on as they have over the centuries in providing care where care is needed.

My friend states, and I quote again: "The Government is confident that the current negotiations with the Federal administration and the medical profession will enable all citizens of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... Manitoba to enjoy the benefits of medical service insurance as soon as possible. Nevertheless, while the social aspects of medical service insurance has remained paramount, costs must be considered." Here is this priority-conscious government talking. Costs must be considered. Of course they must be considered. For the fiscal period 1958-59 the Department of Health Estimates totalled \$10.7 million, my honourable friend states.

Then he goes on to say, "In the fiscal year 1966-67 comparable figures for Health Estimates are \$28.2 million" -- \$28.2 million for health in Manitoba. Priorities? The care of the people of our province? Mr. Chairman, do you know what the estimates are for the Department of Highways in the Province of Manitoba for this year? \$40.6 million. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this government who looks after the needs of the people are prepared to spend \$40.6 million on roads; \$28.2 million on Health. Then they talk of priorities. How ridiculous, how nonsensical, how inhuman can a Government be that is prepared to spend \$40.6 million on a road program because it is more attractive, particularly when an election is in the offing, than it is to spend a few extra bucks to provide a fellow who's income is only \$75.00 per month with a Medicare card.

My friend's statement goes on further, Mr. Chairman, and he states thus: "Costs in the present fields of Health service assumed as the responsibility of Government are rising, and any further responsibilities assumed by Government in the field of health services must be carefully considered in the light of the ability of our people to sustain them." It doesn't matter about \$40.6 million for roads. There is nothing that I have found in any document of Government that they are worried about the expenditures for roads. But in the field of health it's a horse of a different colour.

My honourable friend, the Minister of Health, on Page 5 of his statement, deals with the question of getting Federal participation in the various fields of mental health and T.B., and he says that there is no provision for Federal participation. No, I'm sorry Mr. Chairman, this isn't the part. I'll come to that a little later dealing with mental care and T. B. care.

But my honourable friend mentions here that in order to assist in the necessary expansion and teaching of research facilities in the fields of health science, the Federal Government in 1965 proposed the establishment of the Health Resources Fund. "Manitoba, in submitting a tentative program for the expansion of our medical school and research facilities, teaching hospitals and other health schemes, health sciences, training institutions, which will aggregate in excess of \$35 million in the next 15 years for capital construction alone, has me deeply concerned with the fact that no provision has been made so far for Federal participation in the operating costs that are involved. The Province will be hard-pressed to assume these very large charges at its own expense. "Unless," my friend states, "the Federal Government is prepared to share in these costs, either through grants or through a fiscal equivalent by which the province may raise the money itself, the rate of development of the program will be seriously hampered." In other words, Mr. Chairman, what my friend is saying here, as I interpret it, that unless the Federal Government comes to the aid of the province, the rate of development of the program in health will be seriously hampered.

But the next sentence is most significant, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, because my honourable friend says, "Were it not for the suddenly increased requirement which will be made upon Canadian physicians and Canadian schools of medicine, a much more lengthy process would have permitted the universities to accept the large responsibilities." My honourable friend in this statement admits -- admits that the people of Manitoba are not being cared for medically. If we ever heard a statement which says that, it's the one that my honourable friend "Were it not for the suddenly increased requirement for medical attention." Mr. Chairman, does my honourable friend think that a medical insurance scheme will automatically mean added work for our physicians and doctors of a frivolous nature or because it's needed? I say to my honourable friend that it will only be -- any additional work required will only be needed because the people have been deprived of the medical services that they were entitled to over the period of time as evidenced by the attitude of the Department of Welfare in the field of Medicare.

On many an occasion, Mr. Chairman, when dealing with the Department of Education estimates, we of the New Democratic Party have asked the administration to help out our medical students, to remove from them some of the burdens - the students in medicine - to remove from them some of the burdens of the costs of education. Mr. Chairman, a medical student pays a higher fee, to the University of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I say if this government was sincere in making provisions for the medical profession and the students, the absolute reverse should be true. If, as the Minister states, that the provision of adequate

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...medical care in the Province of Manitoba will add to the burden of the medical profession, I say if it does it's because the government has been negligent in providing facilities, in providing opportunities and incentives for our students to enter into the field of medicine. It's true, I agree with my honourable friend that we haven't got enough doctors. I say to my honourable friend that many of the doctors that we have practising today are only practising in the field of medicine because of the scholarships, the educational plans that were made available to ex-servicemen following World War II, because they had an opportunity under the rehabilitation grants of the Federal Government of that day to go into our universities and take up medical training at little or no cost to themselves, and I say Mr. Chairman, it may be necessary for us here in the Province of Manitoba to institute a similar program again in order to provide the doctors, not only in Manitoba but across the country as well.

The Manitoba Government, my friend says, will continue to express concern that the decisions in this field are necessary to facilitate developments in these plans for expansion in the fields of teaching and research until the Federal Government takes the necessary action. "Until the Federal Government takes the necessary action." His this government no foresight? Does it always have to sit back and await somebody else taking the necessary action? Has it no gumption? I admit, Mr. Chairman, that possibly in the field of Medicare it hasn't got the attraction of the floodway, hasn't got the attraction of a four-lane highway or many other aspects of government. And I say to the Minister of Health, surely to goodness expansion does not have to await necessary action by the Federal Government.

And then my friend goes on, dealing with the other recommendations of the Government of Manitoba. They list these: "Included among those which were recommended by the Government of Manitoba for immediate implementation were the following: 1. The cost of the treatment of mental illness should be borne on a fifty-fifty basis between the federal and provincial authority. 2. The cost of operation of tubercular hospitals and care should be on a fifty-fifty basis. 3. Under the Hospital Services Plan there should be a fifty-fifty sharing of depreciation, interest and administration charges."

Mr. Chairman, if this government would try and get the Dominion Government and the other provinces to join in the recommendations of the Hall Commission Report, these items would be taken care of under a fully comprehensive medicare insurance scheme. I say to the government, instead of sitting back on their haunches in the field of health, and in particular in the field of health insurance, they should be trying to get the Federal Government to fully implement the recommendations of the Hall Commission.

Number 4 of the recommendations of the Government of Manitoba: "A new formula should be devised for hospital construction based on 40 percent provincial contribution, 40 percent federal contribution, and a 20 percent local contribution. Here again, Mr. Chairman, so typical of that government in sloughing off to others what is their responsibility. Twenty percent hospital construction costs on the overburdened local taxpayer. I'm not going further into that argument, Mr. Chairman, because we've had it time after time, but it does reflect on the attitude of this ultra-conservative government in the field of Medicare.

And then finally, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend winds up his statement by stating that action on these recommendations on the part of the Federal Government would permit greater expansion in the field of health services. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't doubt but what they would. As far as this government is concerned, if somebody else was paying the shot, they'd gladly accept it. My friend states that it is a matter of concern and regret that the Federal Government has failed to implement these proposals. And then he goes on in his final paragraph: "Despite disagreement with the Federal Government on the phasing and methods of implementation of certain elements in the provision of health services, the Government of Manitoba proposes to introduce a Medical Services Insurance Plan designed to provide comprehensive benefits in the field of physician's care, offer universal coverage, be available at a cost within the reach of all, maintain the maximum possible freedom for both the individual and the physician, and to take full advantage of federal participation will be ready by July 1967.

But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, in the meantime my honourable friend the Minister of Health has stated that the Government of Manitoba are going to try and persuade the federal authority to lessen the requirements of entry into a health scheme. I say to my honourable friend, it's not good enough, and if my honourable friend means that on July 1st, 1967, we're going to enter into a medical health scheme based on "available at a cost within the reach of all," if he means, Mr. Chairman, that a single person who is in the receipt of \$75.00 a month,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... who hasn't required drugs over the past year, is in a position to pay the premiums for medicare insurance, if this is what he means, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Government of Manitoba: Cut out the horseplay, I say to the Government of Manitoba: call a spade a spade. If you're not prepared to accept your responsibility, to even accept the minimum requirements for medical health care that are laid down at the present time by the federal authority, have enough gumption and intestinal fortitude not to play around as the Minister played around in his statement. Because it means nothing. There's no indication, Mr. Chairman, at all in the statement of my honourable friend the Minister of Health, exactly what the position of the Province of Manitoba is, except that between now and July 1st in our centenary year, the Government of Manitoba is going to try its utmost to dissuade the Federal Government from implementing the minimum recommendations which were made by the Hall Commission Report in the field of Medicare.

It's not enough. It's not enough, Mr. Chairman, and I say to the Minister of Health, think it over once again. The people of Manitoba are well worthy of more consideration than that contained in the statement of the Minister of Health. They're well worthy of more consideration than has so far been given by the Government of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at the offset, I said that I was also going to deal with the question of the mental retardates. I have some - important I think - matters to discuss under the question of the retardates. I've been on my feet I think too long now, but I think that it's been important and I will raise the question on the mental retardation a little later on in the estimates.

In conclusion of this aspect of dealing with the question of the Minister's salary, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, the Minister of Health, I do believe - I do believe sincerely that many of the phrases that are contained in this statement that you read to us last night are statements of fallacy with which your heart could not find agreement. I think many of these statements only reflect - only reflect the ultra-conservative outlook of so many of your colleagues opposite, particularly those, Mr. Chairman, who laughed during many of my remarks this afternoon when I stated what the needs of the Province of Manitoba and its people are.

MR. CARROLL: I would just like to clarify a point that I rose on a while ago. Was the letter that you referred to, the letter dated January 31, signed by Mr. MacKenzie? Letters that I usually sign usually suggest that if the circumstances of the individual should change, we would be very pleased to look at the situation again.

I think my honourable friend knows that there are many thousands of people in the Province of Manitoba today getting only \$75 a month who get Medicare; many of whom get, in addition to Medicare, cash supplements. He chooses of course to ignore the fact that we are paying on the basis of need. He's never been able to understand these principles which have been explained to him on a good many occasions. I think we take a pretty generous outlook in many cases through the question of Medicare and I think some people get it who might not qualify on a very strict interpretation of policy, but I think we've tried to be fairly generous in our interpretation of this. I'm not saying that all of the items which are in the present budget are generous, but I'm saying that some of them run a pretty tight ship at home in order to get along. But I think generally speaking he was quite unfair in his reference to this particular case. I think there's some other extenuating circumstances here and I think the department has looked on it with an open mind and has given a fairly fair consideration to the case that was made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party in presenting the case to the department.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may - my honourable friend is endeavouring to suggest that I just pulled out of the hat an odd case. I say such is not the case. My friend said that had there been some other circumstances in this that the party concerned might have been granted a Medicare card. Mr. Chairman, I say to the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, what in effect are you saying? In this letter is, that if this man had of had a number of drug bills which would have used up the difference between the \$67.50 and the \$75.00 - drug and medical bills - then my benevolent friend would have awarded him a Medicare card. I ask my honourable friend, is he aware or is he not aware as to whether or not this recipient of only \$75 a month did not have a medical bill or a drug bill because he couldn't blasted well pay for them.

Mr. Chairman, it doesn't take very many prescriptions or calls from a doctor today to use up \$7.50 in a month, and it could conceivably be that this particular individual did not have a doctor when he needed one, did not have medication when he needed medication because he

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... didn't have the wherewithal in order to obtain it. What my friend the Minister of Welfare is saying in effect is that if this man had of piled up at the local drug store a bill, if my friend referred to in this letter had to have had medicare services without payment to the doctor, then after that is done, my benevolent friend would have awarded him a Medicare Card.

I say, Mr. Chairman, the time for a person to have a Medicare Card is before he requires a doctor. My friend the Minister of Welfare is putting the cart before the horse. What he is saying to people like this - and I'm sure that there are many of them - what my friend is saying is you get out, spend your money on medicare, medical attention, and after you've done it and you become medically indigent, then we'll give you a card so that you can receive this service. My friend, you've got a lot to learn.

MR. CARROLL: I think what I'm saying is my friend has presented no evidence that there is medical need here. I think if he wanted to present that kind of evidence, the department would be very pleased to look at it again. It sort of reminds me of the argument -- at least the little speaking notes that the man had on his speech saying, "Yell like hell, the argument's weak," and I think this is what he's saying today. His argument is very weak in this particular case.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing; I'm not yelling except on occasions, and if Mr. Chairman - if, Mr. Chairman, perchance I yell, I want to say to the Government of Manitoba the soft approach hasn't worked. Apparently I can't reach into the heart or the brain of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare with reason, with logic, and with concrete cases. I can't do that. So, Mr. Chairman, if it becomes necessary to become a little bit more vociferous, if it becomes necessary in order to achieve what is needed that I do have to raise my voice, that I do have to yell, then I want to say to my honourable friend that is the method that I will use.

My friend says once again that I haven't established a case. Shall I read it again? Maybe somebody didn't realize; maybe even the Minister, although he's got a copy of the letter in front of him, can't read it, so I'll read it for him. "In assessing this gentleman's eligibility for Medicare benefits the only income that is being taken into account is the \$75 per month Old Age Security Pension. This man's budget has been worked out according to the regulations under The Social Allowances Act as follows: Rent, \$25 a month." I ask you, Mr. Chairman, I ask all the members of this committee, what type of accommodation can a person get

MR. CARROLL: Do you know what he is living in?

MR. PAULLEY: I know what he's living in, yes.

MR. CARROLL: Tell the committee.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll tell the committee what he's living in, but I'm dealing now with the regulations. The allowance, Mr. Chairman, for this individual as a single man for rent is \$25 a month. I ask you conservative members of this committee, what type of living accommodation can you get for \$25 a month? My honourable friend the Minister of Welfare oft tells us of the contribution the government is making for slum clearance in Winnipeg. I say, Mr. Chairman, that practically the only place in Manitoba where a single person can get a room for \$25 a month is in the slum areas in Winnipeg.

My honourable friend said, "Tell the whole story." I'll tell the story, Mr. Chairman. This man is a caretaker in a block and part of his duties is looking after the block - firing, sweeping, and cleaning - and he's living in a suite that if it was normally rented out would rent for somewhere in the neighbourhood of about \$75 a month. So they don't take that into consideration. They say that the allowance is for \$25 a month, and because you look after the suite, we'll consider as expenditure the \$25.00. That's the story isn't it?

MR. CARROLL: Pretty close.

MR. PAULLEY: Now then, Mr. Chairman, what my honourable friend was saying though is this fellow shouldn't be doing that. In effect - what in effect do you say? He should be living in a \$25 a month accommodation.

MR. CARROLL: No - no.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, what do you mean by me telling the whole story, because he's not receiving any income, he's just living in a better place of accommodation than he could get for \$25.00.

Then according to the regulations of my benevolent friend the Minister of Welfare, there's an allowance of \$2.50 for utilities. This man is allowed for food, \$25 a month. I want to ask the Honourable Member for Churchill, can you live on less than a dollar a day for food? I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that's what the Minister of Welfare says. Yes, my friend the Minister

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... of Welfare says, so far as food is concerned, \$25 a month is sufficient for a single person - benevolent, generous, big-hearted Conservatives; clothing, \$5.00 a month; household and personal, \$10 a month; sum total of \$67.50 a month, and because this man gets \$75 a month, I presume that the Honourable Minister of Welfare is really suggesting that he should be banking the \$7.50.

My honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, and his predecessor, oft tries to illustrate cases where the regulations are exceeded on the basis of need. We have had many arguments in this House as to whether we have a means test or a needs test, and I have maintained, and I still maintain that this Government has in effect a means test, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have proven this afternoon that it's among the meanest types of tests that's enforced in any province in our Dominion.

Then in order to put the record straight completely for the benefit of my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, the letter says, "This gentleman's drug requirements appear to be negligible for he has had virtually no expenses of this nature during the past year." He should have incurred them shouldn't he? In other words, Mr. Chairman, what the department is saying, you should have gone out and incurred drug expenses, then because his estimated monthly expenses are below his monthly income, he is not eligible on the basis of need - not eligible on the basis of need at the present time for Medicare benefits - not eligible because he receives \$75 a month as a sole income.

Then as I state, Mr. Chairman, the final sentence, "I trust the above information will be satisfactory." My only comment on the last sentence, Mr. Chairman, once again is that the only satisfactory part about the thing is that it does indicate to me the callousness of the administration that this province is being governed with at the present time.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, we have been treated to two very good speeches today. I'm going to go home in about 25 minutes time and I'm going to sit before my family and I'm going to wonder whether some inhuman type of person is sitting before them tonight after hearing the Honourable Member for Burrows and after hearing the Honourable the Leader of the NDP.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I just say to my honourable friend, it was not meant personal. I deal with your government as a group.

MR. WITNEY: Well, I feel a lot better. I noticed that the Honourable the Member of the NDP started out tonight and he said, "I want to compliment the Minister." I was a little surprised at the time that he said that and I did feel just slightly taken aback by it. I had no need for alarm or any cause for concern that the honourable member actually meant that he was going to compliment me as the Minister of Health today. He has made his position quite clear with respect to this statement that I read yesterday. I have made our position quite clear with it, and particularly when it comes down to the last paragraph that we have here, I think possibly we should re-read it once more because it says, "Despite disagreement with the Federal Government on the phasing and methods of implementation of certain elements in the provision of health services, the Government of Manitoba proposes to introduce a medical services insurance plan designed to provide comprehensive benefits in the field of physicians' services; offer universal coverage; be available at a cost within the reach of all; maintain the maximum possible freedom of the individual and of the physician; and take full advantage of federal participation. The Federal Government has stated that it will be ready to participate in any plan which qualified on July 1, 1967, and Manitoba intends to meet that date."

Now during the course of your remarks you said that we were going to try in some way, as I understood them, to change the qualifications that the Federal Government had set down. The qualifications that the Federal Government had set down were - and you will find them on Page 3 - they were: Scope of Benefits - the plan should offer all services provided by physicians, both general practitioners and specialists. The Coverage - there must be universal coverage. Public Administration -- (Interjection) -- according to the Federal Government, they have defined it as being 90 percent rising to 95 percent on the second year. And on the Public Administration - a universal plan with federal contribution must be a plan for which the Provincial Government takes full responsibility. Transferability of Benefits. We have simply said in the statement that we are going to meet by July 1, 1967, those requirements that are set down by the Federal Government. So I didn't understand when he was making his remarks today where he got the impression that we were trying to modify those four benefits which the Federal Government have set out quite clearly in the two meetings that have been held, one with the Premiers and the Prime Minister, and the other with the Ministers of Health.

(MR. WITNEY cont'd).

He also referred to another area - and I am sure that he didn't quite mean it - he spoke about the amount of money that was being spent on highways, and he said that in the Department of Health in the estimates of this year that we have before us now, we are going to be spending roughly around \$29 million. But in 1965 the Department of Health spent \$24,400,000 in round figures, and it also spent, through the Manitoba Hospital Commission, \$48,500,000; and if you want to add the two of them together, you come down with a figure of \$72,900,000 being spent on the health of the people of this province. Then of course you do not take into account the work that is being done by the Department of Welfare which I noted that you took some umbrage about in the course of your speech today. So I suggest to you that when you look at this \$40 million on highways and you look at the amount of money that we have for health, that you must also look at the over-all figure which is being spent in the Department of Health - in 1965, \$72,954,703.

Now you also mentioned too that we were not providing facilities. I would like to take you out to Selkirk and show you the facilities that we have -- and I didn't mean that in a derogatory sense, if we both went I'm not sure who would come out -- however, if you go to Selkirk, the Psychiatric Institute which is doing a remarkable job in the field of health; if you want to go to Portage la Prairie and see the new facilities that are there for the retarded children, the cottages that we have at the present time, and you'd see the work that is being done.

Those are facilities that this penny-pinching government that you spoke of, this terribly group of people over here, these are the facilities that they have provided. And right in here -- well, as a government working with the taxpayers' money, we have provided them, and in the estimates coming up for the Department of Health in this forthcoming fiscal year are two more cottages out there at Portage la Prairie to serve people in the field of health, people who have not got all the benefits and all the advantages that we have. These people back here - and this Minister, this terrible fellow - is one of the men that helped to put up those facilities.

Then if you want to take a look in the field of social rehabilitation; if you want to take a look at the red book and you see what has been done in the red book: - Sheltered Workshop; Skills Unlimited. And the vocational counsellors; Broadway Home, the numbers of people who are coming from our Portage facility, coming from the community, through the Broadway Home, through rehabilitation services, and who are benefitting to a degree that they have never benefited before. And when you think of the expansion of the Health Units throughout the province, under this Government, this penny-pinching group of fellows back here that you're speaking about, and this awful Minister, and you look at those Health Units, and you see the value of them, and the expansion of them. And here in the Estimates of last year we expanded again, and here in the Estimates of this year we are expanding once more. We're expanding our lab and x-ray facilities. We are building. We are expanding in the field of health. And this question of Medical Services Insurance is only one field.

I have found that in the Royal Commission on Health Services, in their report, that there was an awful lot in there that you could agree with, but it also had some priorities on it. It has some priorities in the field of mental health and we have mentioned them in here. We've mentioned what we were asking in 1962, and there is not a province in Canada that is not asking for the same thing. He can agree with that in the Royal Commission on Health Services. The Royal Commission on Health Services stated that it wanted to have all kinds of facilities and a greater expansion for the mentally retarded. It also mentioned that it wanted to have expansion first, in the field of training professional people and para-professional people. There were all kinds of things that you could agree with in the Royal Commission on Health Services.

And, in the Department of Health, when it came out we went down resolution by resolution, or recommendation by recommendation that was made by the Hall Commission. We took a stand on them in our own Department. We went down to a Health Ministers' meeting. We said to the Federal Government, we said: "Look at the Royal Commission on Health Services - it's your report - and tell us what you are going to do and call . . . back." And this Department of Health was prepared, and when we got back to Ottawa at a Prime Minister and Premiers Conference: Mental Retardation - no; Mental Health - no; Medicare - yes; and then later the Health Resources Fund. The Health Resources Fund came after Medicare. The very fund which was set up to try to provide the people that will be needed to carry on the expanded services that will take place under Medical Services Insurance came afterward, but if you will look at the Royal Commission on Health Services you will find that it came before, and you will find that these things that we were asking for in here, particularly in Mental Health and Mental

(MR. WITNEY cont'd)... Retardation, came before, and we have been asking for them.

You mentioned about the operating costs that we had in these facilities. There's not a province -- in the meetings that I have been at with the Health Ministers, I can't think of a province at the present time that has not asked for operating costs, because they realize that we do need the assistance of the Federal Government in providing for the operating costs of these facilities. We have in here some \$35 million that has been requested by our people here in Manitoba for the Health Resources Fund, - \$35 million. As it stands now we are going to have to find 50 percent of that. But that's not the big cost. The big cost is the one of operating. And there's only one million people here. And we have health; we have mental health. And the highways are important; we must provide for those people who are well, as well as those people who are unwell. And we have to provide for the development of our resources, those that will produce work, apart from providing the resources for those who unfortunately, and for no reason of their own, happen to be ill. We have to provide for those, too, one million people, and we have to provide the operating costs for the new capital facilities that are needed to produce the professional talent, the para-professional talent, to make these programs work, because without them they won't. We can make all the words we want in here, but without the doctors and without the nurses and the para-professional people, we can't make these programs effective at all.

Now I don't wish to try to rise to the heights of oratory that my honourable friend across the way rose to. I picked out the one or two points that I felt that I should have a few comments about; I have made my few comments about them. You have laid down your position; we have laid down our position; and there we rest for the moment.

Now we also had a speech from the Honourable the Member for Burrows. He spoke about the Children's Hospital. And I think possibly at this time that first of all I should express to him some grave concern about the opening remark he made. He said that the children in the Children's Hospital are not getting good care. I disagree with that. The Children in the Children's Hospital are being given excellent care by very excellent professional and para-professional people, right today, despite the difficulties that they might be working under. I would not want to leave in this province the impression that the children in the Children's Hospital are not getting good care. They are, and they will continue to get good care because the devoted people over there will see to it that they do.

Now, in making a statement on the Children's Hospital, I think we might go back for a little history, because the Honourable the Member for Burrows went back into history. I am going back a little further than he is -- and you'll excuse me, Mr. Chairman, if I read this. I think it is important. They've asked for a statement. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked for one yesterday.

The original hospital at Redwood and Main was built in 1911. With only very minor alterations during that time, it provided services for about 130 patients up to the end of 1956. The records show that during this time room was made for about 30 additional patients. In the same interval, the population of Manitoba almost doubled - from 460,000 to 850,000. One can share in retrospect a sense of achievement as a group of dedicated people - and you mentioned them today - who finally replaced this obsolete hospital with the new 232-bed hospital at the medical centre.

It appears that the opening of the present hospital in December 1956 was the culmination of 11 years of intensive planning and sum collecting by the Children's Hospital board. The hospital cost \$2,500,000, the greater part of which was financed from voluntary donations. Less than two years after this hospital opened, the provincial Hospital Services Insurance Program came into existence, and immediately thereafter a great many of the 100 hospitals in the province saw fit to reassess their facilities in light of the fact that the financial barrier to hospital admission had been removed. The Children's Hospital was one of these. The government's answer at the time was to point out that a piecemeal approach to development of hospital services would not be possible; what was needed was a comprehensive plan covering the entire province. And this was why the Hospital Survey Board was appointed, which began its study in the autumn of 1959 and brought in a report early in 1961.

In its submission to this board, the Children's Hospital of Winnipeg proposed an expansion to 350 beds from the existing 232 beds at an estimated cost of \$2.5 million. The survey board recommended an addition of 100 beds and some provision for psychiatric facilities. And in a letter dated January 22, 1962, the Minister of Health at that time notified the hospital that the addition of 100 medical and surgical and 16 psychiatric beds was approved, and that

(MR. WITNEY cont'd)... grants for this purpose would be made available in the fiscal years 1964-65 through 1967-68. In this letter the hospital was advised that, and I quote: "Because of the nature, size and duration of the program, you will realize that revisions may be necessary from time to time. For instance, although we believe the financial resources will be available as forecast, should any unforeseen circumstances intervene it will be necessary to defer projects for short periods."

From early 1962 to the spring of 1964 the board of Children's Hospital attended to the development of their basic or functional program, and during the same period the hospital board expressed grave concern as to their ability to raise the owner's equity of 20 percent for their new construction. On April 28, 1964, the hospital wrote to the Minister of Health as follows: - and part of the letter is here: "The Children's Hospital has completed writing its proposed functional program, and this represents nearly two years of study on the part of our hospital consultant and architects." At this time also the Legislature took action to alleviate the problem of raising funds for the owner's equity. An amendment was passed to The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act and assented to on August 27, 1964, enabling the Metropolitan Corporation to contribute to the costs of hospital construction. And I think the honourable members will remember the debate that took place at that time on this particular bill. But it was passed.

During this period also, the commission undertook a reassessment of pediatric bed needs in the metropolitan Winnipeg area which resulted in a letter dated October 28, 1964, to the hospital, in which it was proposed that the hospital should be expanded to 320 beds, including 16 short-stay and 20 long-stay psychiatric beds, rather than the 350 beds proposed originally. The commission's revision of the number of beds was mainly due to the fact that two other new hospitals were being planned with a certain number of pediatric beds in each.

Another consideration was to relate the number of beds and services to the actual requirement. It is a fact, for instance, that in the year 1959 Children's Hospital provided slightly more days of care to patients than it did in 1965. It is also a fact that in the year 1955 there were slightly more babies born than in the year 1965. Since the hospital admits only children under 16, it is not affected by the total population of the province, and even less by the fact that we have more old people, which is such an important factor in the requirement for adult beds.

The hospital considered the commission's proposal and on January 21, 1965 accepted it on the understanding that provision would be made for a future expansion to 350 beds, not including long term psychiatric. In February of 1965, there was a public announcement of the Children's Hospital development plan, which was now estimated to cost \$5 million. Thereafter the hospital undertook to adjust its functional program in line with the approved project.

Details of the program were discussed from time to time between the hospital and the commission staff members, until on July 5, 1965, the program was ready for formal submission to the Manitoba Hospital Commission. The hospital submission was in the form of an architectural program including schematic drawings, outline specifications, and preliminary cost estimates of \$7,902,408. At a meeting on July 28, 1965 between the commission and hospital representatives, including board, administrative and medical staff members as well as the architect and consultant retained by the hospital, the commission expressed concern at the increase in the cost estimates. It was agreed that a working party of hospital and commission staff members would undertake an analysis to see whether cost savings could be effected. It should be pointed out here that these increases in cost do not so much reflect a rise in prices nor greater precision in estimating; mainly the cost increases reflect changes in the basic program of the hospital. As an example, in its submission to the hospital survey board in 1960, the hospital provided for an increase of 3,600 square feet in the total laboratory space, to bring the hospital's total to less than 6,000 square feet. The hospital submission in July 1965 contained a provision for over 12,000 square feet of laboratory space. The revised program now approved by the commission, stipulates 8,000 square feet of laboratory space. This is merely one easily identifiable example of the kind of give and take which has led to the present stage in the development of the hospital.

Children's Hospital of Winnipeg now has the green light to proceed with the detailed planning of their expansion project. On March 9th the hospital received a letter from the Hospital Commission authorizing them to proceed with sketch plans, specifications and equipment listings on the basis of an approved cost of \$6,200,000 for the project. This cost is \$1,200,000 more than the original estimate of \$5 million, but quite a bit less than the almost \$8 million

(MR. WITNEY cont'd)... estimated by the hospital when they first presented their architectural program to the commission at the end of July 1965, seven months ago. In the process of reducing the cost by \$1 3/4 million, the project has been left intact in all its essentials. The more major savings have been achieved through alternative proposals for an underground parking contemplated at one time, elimination of one of the swimming pools (the hospital will still have its physiotherapy pool) and through modifications in space requirements such as in the laboratory and in some installations and equipment.

The new cost of \$6,200,000 is still substantial in terms of meeting the need for hospital beds. We are adding 88 beds to the hospital's existing 232 beds which were built in 1967 at a cost of only \$2.8 million. While the number of beds will increase by one-third, the new hospital will actually be more than twice the size of the old - and this because of the requirements for service areas, teaching and research. And I might mention, while I'm on the subject, that the Victoria General Hospital has also just ended the sketch-planning stage. The cost for that 250-bed hospital is \$7,750,000 including also a nursing school and a 120-bed residence. This will be a unique hospital in that the potential of automation, including extensive computer application, is being studied, and one is tempted to compare the cost of this hospital or the \$7 million cost of the new 258-bed Grace Hospital, which includes a 144-bed residence, with the \$6.2 million to provide 88 extra beds at Children's. Such a comparison may not be fair because of the need for service areas and the heavy teaching and research commitments that are involved at the Children's Hospital. We did have at one time a comparison made about the generosity, with a statement saying that the hospital received nothing from the government. Nothing, except \$13.5 million in six years in operating funds - and federal funds would be in that too. Nothing except an increase of \$1 million annually as between 1959 and 1965, an increase of 70 percent in operating costs. Nothing, except the money to increase the total paid staff from 400 to almost 500 equivalent full-time people, an increase of 100, or 25 percent, even though days of care did not increase during this period. And during the same time, the student nurses doubled and medical students doubled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8: o'clock.