

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 2, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready to proceed? The resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

WHEREAS various aspects of expropriation by corporations and government authorities having power to expropriate land have been considered by The Law Reform Committee and by members of the staff of certain departments of the government, of various Crown corporations, and of certain municipal corporations;

AND WHEREAS The Law Reform Committee recommended the enactment of a new Expropriation Act containing provisions relating to procedures which would apply to all expropriations of land conducted under Acts of the Legislature;

AND WHEREAS a draft Expropriation Act has been prepared based to a large extent on the recommendations of The Law Reform Committee;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that a committee of this House should consider all matters relating to the procedure to be followed on expropriation of land and, in particular, to consider the draft Bill which has been prepared;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this session do inquire into and report to the House with respect to all matters relating to the procedures to be followed on expropriations of land conducted under Acts of the Legislature and, in particular, to study and report to the House as to the desirability of enacting the draft Bill which has been prepared based on the recommendations of The Law Reform Committee or other legislation;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders shall have power to sit during the present session and recess after prorogation to hear representations, and to report to this House on the matters referred to it at the next session of the Legislature;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of the duties ordered by the committee, in recess after prorogation, as are approved by the Comptroller-General;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of the kind and nature required to assist the said committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and provided the same have received the prior approval of The Treasury Board

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee will realize that this appears by way of resolution only because of the latter three paragraphs of the resolution which would empower this committee to sit after recess or prorogation and to continue with its work. No one can accurately forecast whether in fact, this procedure will be needed or not. I would anticipate that perhaps because of the detailed nature of the legislation, that it would be

(MR. LYON cont'd). . . . necessary for the Statutory Orders Committee to have extra time to consider this important bill.

I should, I hope without breaching the rules, also tell the honourable members that the bill that would be proposed to be reviewed by the committee would be the same expropriation bill, substantially the same bill as appeared before the House last session, which in turn was referred to a committee of the House for study. Copies of this bill are available I believe in the Legislative Counsel's office if they aren't here at the table and can be distributed almost immediately for honourable members to consider. The only reason the Bill was not attached or appended as a schedule to the resolution is because it would have taken up about eight or ten or more pages on the Order Paper and so for the sake of expediency we are distributing the bill separately so that honourable members will know the Bill in question.

This resolution has the effect then of resuming the study which the House began last year, was about to begin last year, on the new expropriation act which was introduced by my predecessor and I would recommend the resolution to the House.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General, is it not the intention then to follow the procedure of last year and have the Bill introduced and read a second time and then be referred to the committee, because it seems to me that that would be the preferable course. I would think that it would not perhaps take as exhaustive a debate as it did on the former occasion. If the Bill is substantially, almost exactly the same as before, we could do what's been suggested on other occasions and take the speeches as being read to quite an extent but I would think that some method is required in addition to what my honourable friend the Attorney-General has mentioned so far, because I would think we simply can't refer a draft bill without at least properly identifying that draft bill to a committee. So I would suggest to the Honourable the Attorney-General that we proceed as we did last year and following the acceptance of this resolution, have the bill introduced and taken as far as second reading before it is considered.

The Honourable the Attorney-General may recall that I had some grave doubts about certain principles in that bill and if they remain as they were before I will likely have the same reservations that I had before. For that reason I must say that I am glad to see it being referred to a committee, because I think that is all to the good, that we should have a discussion in a committee with lots of time and the experts there, both the Law Reform Committee members who have drafted the Bill and knowledgeable people in the expropriation field that may wish to give us the reasons, as they see it, as to why those provisions should be included, and then also the opportunity for people who hold other views to come before the committee. So I am quite in favour of the draft bill going to the committee, Mr. Chairman, but I would suggest that we do it in the regular way of having it go as far as second reading and have the legislature adopt it at least in principle before it goes to that committee for further consideration.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N. D. P.) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if I may in connection with this resolution that we have before us, direct a question or two to my honourable friend the Attorney-General. First of all might I ask when did we set up the Law Reform Committee referred to in this resolution and if we didn't set them up, may the honourable gentleman inform us as to who this or what this Law Reform Committee is comprised of. Is it some ad hoc committee that has any bearing insofar as this House is concerned, or exactly what is this Law Reform Committee that my honourable friend refers to because I haven't recalled in recent years that any authorization has been made in the House to the setting up of such a committee.

Also in the preamble of the resolution reference is made to members of the staff of certain departments of government, of various crown corporations and certain municipal corporations. I think that it would be worthwhile if my honourable friend would elaborate, at least for my benefit and I am sure for other members of the committee, as to the status of these various bodies and the individuals concerned so that we might have a better idea of what we are considering and the source from which the draft bill came.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I remember the Bill that was introduced last year on this very subject and certainly I had a good number of reservations on that bill at that particular time and if this is going to be substantially the same bill, is it the reason the government expects such drastic changes and that they think it will require reprinting before they can submit it to the government in the normal way. It appears to me rather strange to introduce and refer matters to a committee in the way they are proposing to do it now. I certainly look forward to going through this Bill and making my recommendation as to changes.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Honourable Member for Lakeside in his suggestion that the draft bill should be submitted to the House and go through the processes of second reading; unless of course, the government wishes to attach a copy of the draft to the resolution because unless they attach a copy of the draft to the resolution or bring in a draft bill into this House, how is that committee going to identify the bill or the draft to which this resolution refers?

I quite agree though that the proper procedure is for it to go to this committee, because I think this is a matter which is of vital importance to the people of Manitoba considering the number of expropriations that have taken place in this province during the past eight or ten years; and I think it is pretty nearly time too that we had a uniform practice established so that all bodies vested with the power of expropriation would use the same procedure.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, in answer first of all to my honourable friend from Lakeside, he is quite right, that there are two or perhaps even more alternative procedures that could be adopted for committee consideration of a bill. Last year we adopted the procedure that he has made reference to, in other words, the bill was brought into the House in the first instance, was given first and second reading and then was referred after second reading to a committee of the House. The legislature subsequently was dissolved and that committee of the House was not able to deal with the matter so we have to start afresh again.

We considered his alternative method - which I suggest is equally valid for the very simple reason that if we were to follow the same procedure as last year, which I admit could be done, I would bring in the Bill, it would have first reading, second reading and then would be referred to the committee. If as we anticipate the committee would have to sit after recess, after prorogation, and then come back with its report in the next subsequent session of the House we would have to start all over again with the first reading, second reading, then with the benefit of the committee's report we could put it through presumably all stages of its readings. So there is no purpose to this mode of procedure, other than to not involve the House in a first and second reading of the bill this year, which might well, in effect, be negated by the prorogation of the House sometime later this spring and the work of the committee of the House carrying on. This is merely an alternative procedure which I commend to honourable members because of the relative simplicity of it.

My honourable friend from Selkirk, dealing on the same point said, "What is the Bill?" Well he will have the Bill in front of him and it is substantially the same bill that we had before us last year. This is the purpose, to have the draft bill in the committee, then let the committee report back to the House after it's made its recommendations on all the sections of this bill, then the bill, having been considered by the committee, can be given first, second and successive readings, or amended even further, but we will obviate the necessity of going through the same procedure two or three times without really getting down to the question of dealing with the Bill which is I think what all the members of the House want to do. And of course the further point that he makes with respect to common expropriation procedures I think is found in this draft Bill.

Referring to the questions by my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, it's really not - I don't know whether I should at this committee resolution stage because we're dealing with the money - whether or not we should vote the money. I will give him a quiet word however and tell him that as I recall - and I would have to check the Act to be absolutely certain of this - a number of years ago, six years ago or thereabout, six or seven years ago, there was an amendment to the Attorney-General's Act permitting the establishment of a Law Reform Committee the members of which were selected by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This committee has in fact been in existence for some seven years or thereabout and it's composed of a number of leading barristers and solicitors from the Province of Manitoba, both from Metro Winnipeg and from outside of the Metro Winnipeg area. We have had a number of measures appear before the House which have emanated from the Law Reform Committee which is really a committee that looks at the principle of certain statutes, statutes largely in the legal field, and this Bill was one that was referred to this committee I believe some two or three years ago and as my honourable friend, The Provincial Secretary said at second reading I believe last year, he made mention of the fact that the Law Reform Committee had dealt with this Bill. In fact I think he even paid them a tribute on behalf of himself and members of the House for the work that they had done in connection with the Bill.

Secondly, as to the reference in the resolution to consultations with government staff people and with municipal staff people, this as I am told was done over the past two or three

(MR. LYON cont'd). . . . years when the Legislative Counsel had in contemplation the drafting of a new expropriation Act, he did consult with various departments of government who are concerned with this. He also consulted with some of the municipal corporations, I think primarily their solicitors, in order to get the benefit of their views before a draft Bill was brought before the House last year. That very simply is the explanation for this mode of procedure.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I want to express the same thoughts that were expressed earlier today as to the procedure. It seems to me that rather than save time and effort, I think there's duplication right off the bat. As a matter of fact in my naive way in being still trained as a municipal person who watches every dollar, I thought that the hope was that there would be a saving of not having to print the Bill again but be able to use last year's bill for the purpose of the committee but I find that's not correct and there has been a new bill drafted -- printed rather except that instead of being called a bill it has another title namely: Proposed Draft Expropriation Act.

Now it seems to me the proposal is we're going to take this into a committee, the committee will study it, will deal with it and then make a report back to the House presenting a recommended second Draft Expropriation Act, I presume, and then it will be brought forward as a Bill recommended by the committee. Then it will be dealt with first, second reading, referred to committee where the whole thing may well be rehashed again and I'm wondering at the feasibility. It seemed to me that last year's procedure was much more sensible. We did have our discussion on the general principle and then it went to committee which could have dealt with it.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the procedure now proposed is a strong indication that we will be dealing with this between sessions -- and assuming that I am right, that my inference is correct, then I must indicate my feeling that it's unfortunate that it is necessary to hold it over another year. Presumably it is necessary and if it is necessary then it should be timely, expropriations take place all the time. The delay I think will certainly hurt, certain people will hurt the methods of expropriation that will be used until its enactment. I would urge the Honourable, the Attorney-General in his capacity as House Leader to see to it that this committee meets quickly and explore the possibility of bringing in its report during this session rather than delay and it would be a pity if the procedure, which was adopted today, will impede the progress and prevent it from being able to be dealt with at this session.

Now the principle of government by committee is one which I think I could accept, I think it might be a good idea that when the government is unsure of what it's proposing that it feels that it would like to share with the entire House the problem with which it is being challenged, that it set up a committee and the committee then make a study and report and then have the aura of being presented by a committee representing all parties, as indeed this has been done in other cases where I suggest the government wasn't quite so sure of its ground and I think that's probably a good idea.

I'm hoping that when the committee meets the report and recommendations of the Law Reform Committee will be brought to us. If my Honourable Leader had only asked me about the Law Reform Committee I could have told him that this is a committee which has been presumably going to make recommendations -- oh for quite some time now -- dealing with limitations, the Statute of Limitations Act and may or may not have met. I don't know whether it meets or not because I believe this committee is the private committee of the Attorney-General and meets probably when he asks them to meet and reports of course only to him. If indeed we knew who were members of the committee we might be able to 'phone them up and say, "Have you fellows met at all, have you done anything?" But not knowing who they are - I suppose we could find out because the Honourable the Attorney-General is correct that back in 1960 an Act was passed which gave the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the right to appoint a committee and presumably in some way or other we could find out who they were. But what their reports are are apparently matters to which we are not privy and I think that that's a pity because to the extent that we're going to deal with their recommendation we ought to know what it is. Therefore I would hope that we will get the benefit.

Well the Honourable the Attorney-General is waving a document at me saying, "There it is," and I don't know whether it is a document which is his own or which is identical with the document each of us has and I will therefore wave back at him a proposed draft expropriation act and wonder out loud whether this is the document that he -- he is nodding his head so it means that this is the document. Well this is really not a recommendation, this is a proposed draft expropriation act and the reasoning behind it is something which we will have to infer

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... from what we read. It maybe will be able to do so.

I understand that rather than just a Law Reform Committee there has been a special committee of real experts dealing with this, people who deal with expropriation in their day to day occupations and I think it's vital that we have their personal attendance at the committee so that we know firstly how matters are being handled now and whether or not the proposed Act will take care of the present deficiencies. So I urge the Minister to proceed with the manner in which he has indicated that we are to deal with it but to proceed quickly to see to it that the committee meets and that the committee make every effort to notify interested parties of its meeting and have several early meetings to determine whether or not this Act can be dealt with in this session and forwarded back to the House for action in this Session.

MR. LYON: I thank the honourable member for commenting and telling us how we can expedite the work of the committee with respect to expropriation because that is precisely what we're trying to do by virtue of this resolution. If we were to follow, and we considered this, if we were to have followed the alternative procedure of bringing in first and second reading, I dare say that would have taken up even more time of the House in debate notwithstanding the fact that we had the very same debate last year. And for the purposes of the record I think it would be interesting to refer to page 1,625 of Hansard of the 1966 Session wherein the Bill was introduced at second reading by the then Attorney-General. There is further debate starting at page 1,996 of last year's Session in Hansard, further debate again at page 2,059 and further debate and the conclusion of the debate on second reading took place at page 2,066 and the pages that follow. This is precisely what we are trying to do. To obviate going through the same procedure again we're asking honourable members of the House to accept this Draft Bill as being substantially the same bill that was presented last year, to have it in the committee, to give consideration to it in the committee and then to report back to the House -- I agree with him if at all possible at this session -- but we remember always that the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee has a number of items on its agenda and this item permitting it to sit beyond prorogation is put in in case it can't complete its work. And it may well be possible if we're going to go into this as thoroughly as I'm sure the honourable members opposite want to go into it and as thoroughly as we want to go into it on this side of the House.

I'm reminded that last year when we did follow the alternative procedure some objection was apparently taken at second reading by members of the House that they were being asked to improve in principle a Bill which a Committee was then going to investigate and perhaps make some change in the principles thereof. So it doesn't really matter I suppose which alternative you choose, you're going to get into trouble one way or the other. I seriously commend this method of procedure to the House. It may be a bit new but there's nothing wrong with newness if it's going to expedite the hearing of the committee, the hearings of the committee, and get on with the work of looking at an Expropriation Act, let the House have a full opportunity through the Committee delve into each of these sections of the Bill in some detail then report back, whether at this session hopefully, or at a subsequent session, whatever the committee finds out, and then get the Bill through the various stages of reading and passed. That's what we're all trying to do. I'm merely suggesting that this procedure -- having looked at both of the procedures with experts, we thought that this procedure would accomplish that end more swiftly than the usual procedure and I commend this mode of action to the members of the House.

MR. GILDAS MÖLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I'm most anxious to see us proceed with this whole question of expropriation. The government has been criticized on many occasions about the method and the variety of methods that have been used and we've had discussions in the House here about the Floodway expropriations, about the Birds' Hill Park expropriations and so on. Certainly this is an urgent matter to be settled here in Manitoba.

In spite of its urgency, however, I would hope that the committee will have ample time to deal with this in detail and to have appearing before it all of the experts that we can get because this is an area where we are dealing with probably one of those things where government interference in private affairs is, if not most harmful, at least most annoying to people, and at times in fact extremely serious in their lives. We have the old adage that a man's home is his castle and yet here by law we say that we can come along and change this, we can take it away from him and this is a right that many people feel is abused at times. So my concern is that we produce out of the debates in the House here and in the committee an Act that will give the maximum protection to the individual while at the same time of course not preventing public

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... developments. Undoubtedly as we go along and as government gets ever bigger and enters into new projects, the importance of expropriation will go beyond its present importance.

Prior to the work of the committee beginning I wonder if the Minister could make available to the committee members any of the studies that have gone on, any recommendations that he has received from various private groups so that the members would have an opportunity to study this and get the various aspects involved. I think here it's important that we not only have the side of the individuals involved in the actual expropriation work but also the side of the individual who is expropriated, the one who has built up a farm or an industry or simply a homestead and then we come along and say the greater good means that it has to be taken away.

I have a case now, a gentleman speaking to me, where an expropriation is taking place, taking away a home which he has built, grounds that he's developed, in an area where he wants to stay, and yet because of another problem it's being expropriated. He doesn't want to leave the area, he simply wants to get other land adjacent and yet he's been told no, you can't have it, we can't do that for you. So these are the type of problems that I hope the Committee, while we can't deal with them in individual detail, that we won't have only the point of view of the experts and departments who deal with the legal aspects of the expropriation but also that other very important aspect of the protection of individual rights.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the procedure suggested by the Honourable the Attorney-General is going to expedite matters at all. I think it would be far better if this Bill were brought into this House now for first and second reading and referred to this committee so that it could be disposed of during this session.

Now the reason why I suggest that is this, that all the members of this House are not on that committee but yet this is a matter in which every member of this House has a vital interest and I envisage most members, whether they belong to this committee or whether they don't, wanting to attend the sittings and the hearings of that committee. I think if we did bring in a Bill now, had it go through second reading and refer to this committee to report to this session of the legislature, I think that it could be done and I think that most members of the House would appreciate the opportunity of being able, during this session, to attend the sittings of that committee.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I'm beginning to object to these bills being brought into the House and referred to committees that'll sit during recess because you can take up an awful lot of time that way and there's nothing going to prevent further debate; and following the usual procedure in the House when that Bill is brought back in at the next session you may have the same rigmarole to go through again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to prolong the debate unduly because I have long ago lost any faith in my ability to make an impression on the front row of the opposite side of the House. I did get far enough last year I think, if my recollection is correct, to get the Honourable the Attorney-General of that day to place upon the record the names of the members of this law reform committee, for which I thanked him and thank him now. I have nothing but good high regard for the folks who worked diligently to try and prepare draft bills for us. But I join with my honourable friend and colleague from Selkirk who suggests that after all it is the responsibility of the government to bring its legislation before us. And I see no reason in the world why we couldn't have passed this Bill this session even with all the meetings that may have to be held.

So, I would strongly recommend once again to the Honourable the Attorney-General that he revise his program and instead of proceeding in this fashion, take the course that was used last year and bring the bill in in the ordinary way. I take it that not many changes have been made from the Bill of last year. I expect that the government having had their reform committee working at it and having themselves undoubtedly given consideration to it, do not intend to make a great many changes but I still think that the committee sittings will be of benefit to give others outside of the House an opportunity to make representation. So, wouldn't the Honourable the Attorney-General be inclined to reconsider.

If he's not prepared to do that, then I would seriously suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should have this document much better identified than it is in the resolution and that it should be appended as part of the motion that is moved or included as a schedule or exhibit A or something that is more definite than just referring to it in the body of the resolution as a Draft Bill.

MR. LYON: This is not a point upon which I wish to waste the time of the House because

(MR. LYON cont'd)..... really it isn't worthy of it. The main purpose of the government is to get on with a study of the Expropriation Act. We have canvassed both methods. There is something to be said for either of them. We have rightly or wrongly however -- we are suggesting this method to the House this year because we really do believe that we can achieve the end that all of us want, namely the detailed consideration and study of this Bill faster by this method than we can by the method that we tried last year. I say that to you quite sincerely, that's our only motivation. We want to get the Act before the committee, we want to get the Act considered by the committee. The only purpose in putting in the money resolutions which we are theoretically supposed to be debating here was to anticipate that in the event that that committee was not able to conclude its work this session, it could sit between sessions and carry on with its work. On sober reflection perhaps we shouldn't even have put that in, we should have waited to see what would happen to the committee but there's no harm in putting it in in any case. If the committee is able to finish this session, well and good, nobody will be any happier than we are but we don't want to inhibit the work of the committee by putting in effect a Damocles sword over their neck and saying you must report back, because this is a very important piece of legislation.

I was looking through here at a speech that was made last year by the Honourable Member from St. John's wherein he said this was a Bill that should take more time for consideration. He was glad it was being referred to a committee because this is the kind of a Bill that should have serious consideration even if between sessions -- and I'm not saying he's saying anything differently this year, but we are impressed with the urgency of it. Again I repeat that we were chastised last year by some members of the House because they were then on the alternative procedure being asked to approve in principle a Bill which was then going for detailed study. So it would appear that of the two methods we've chosen, neither is satisfactory to the honourable members opposite. Well, let's try this one, if it's wrong, we won't use it again. The lawyers point as to what Bill we're going to be studying really is a lawyer's point. I thought of it myself, but again for expediencies sake we distribute the Bill at the time the resolution is before the House. I give my guarantee that this Bill that I'm holding in my right hand at this moment is the Bill that is going to be referred to the committee. If anybody has any doubts about it, bring the Bill along and I'll let you check it word for word with the one that's brought before the committee and you'll find that it is the same. I'm quite free to make that undertaking. This is not a court of law, we're not trying to prove this is a document in evidence. In any case, it seems quite simple to me that this is a procedure that is intended to expedite the hearing and the discussion of the expropriation matter. I do hope it will receive the consideration and support of the House and that we can get on with the business of looking into an Expropriation Act and getting something before this legislature by way of a Bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I hope that my honourable friend the Attorney-General is not attempting to include me in his general observation when he said that honourable gentlemen opposite object to both methods, because I did not object to the method that was employed last year; in fact I complimented the honourable the minister at that time on the fact it was being done that way. So, he cannot quote me as being one of the objectors. I objected to the Bill but not to the method by which it was done. I still say it was the right method then, which per se makes it the wrong method now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise - Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and

IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that "whereas various aspects of expropriation by corporations and government authorities having . . . —(Interjection)— I'm not sure if I can dispense. I think the Speaker can dispense. I think I have to put it on the record. I'm not entirely sure. I would be delighted to dispense with the reading of it but . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: If my honourable friend wants to I would think if he would simply state that it's identical with the one that was read by the Chairman, if that is the case. I believe it is.

MR. LYON: If that's agreeable to the House I'll do that. I move the resolution that is identical to the one which was read by the Chairman, moved and seconded by the Honourable

(MR. LYON cont'd).... the Provincial Treasurer. I thank my honourable friend from Lakeside for the good suggestion.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the House, a Return to an Order of the House No. 21 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, it is with regret that I draw to the attention of the House that the father of my colleague from Inkster has passed away and the last rites will be performed in a matter of three quarters of an hour in one of the synagogues in the north end of Winnipeg, which will necessitate my absence and that of my colleague from Seven Oaks. I'm sure the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, will join with me in the regrets to be extended to my colleague and will understand my absence and that of my colleague for the rest of the sitting, possibly for this afternoon.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House would wish me on behalf of all members, including yourself, Sir, to extend our deep and sincere sympathy to our honourable friend who has suffered this loss and to say that we would like to convey to him and to all the members of his family our sincere sympathy in his bereavement. I know that in making this statement, I speak for all.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was asked yesterday by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a question pertaining to the date of proclamation of The Corrections Act, Chapter 12 of the Statutes of Manitoba for 1966. The Corrections Act was proclaimed and brought into force on the 1st of February 1967 by proclamation published in the Manitoba Gazette dated January 21, 1967. I understand that all provisions of the Act were proclaimed by that proclamation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, that means it was proclaimed yesterday.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, that means it was proclaimed some weeks ago, effective yesterday.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's) Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney-General whether the Law Reform Committee has made a recommendation relating to the Statute of Limitations.

MR. LYON: I would have to answer that rather indecisively by saying this, that there is a Bill on this matter which it is intended to bring before the House during the course of the present session, which I am sure has had the consideration of the Law Reform committee.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I would like to qualify a statement I made - it's recorded on Page 565 of Hansard, Monday January 30th in replying to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and Inkster. In it I stated that "it is my understanding that all councils in all jurisdictions are using Section 338 of The Municipal Act." The statement should be qualified in respect of the cities of Winnipeg and St. Boniface which have full and complete charters embodying all their powers. These charters do contain provisions respecting the veto of the mayor which differ from those contained in Section 338 of The Municipal Act.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. In view of the request that I previously and repeatedly made to the Minister to bring in proper legislation for the protection of people with gas installations, in view of the fact that nothing has been done by him, in view of the fact also that on Tuesday we had another accident such as the one we had in St. Boniface but fortunately there was nothing this time, I wonder if my honourable friend is going to wait for a third accident that might be fatal before bringing in the proper legislation which is very urgent.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend being a little nimbler than I, beat me to request the privilege, Sir, to inform the House of the investigation, surveys and recommendations of the committee relating to damage to above-ground gas installations. And before I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable members, the results of the survey, the recommendations, I would like you to know that in the past ten years there have been 40 reports of such damage involving 84,000 services at the present time and the explosion that occurred on Tache Avenue was the only explosion in connection with damages of this nature.

But, Mr. Speaker, the results of the investigation by officers of the Mechanical and Engineering Branch of the Department of Labour and the Gas Advisory Board, has resulted in

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd). . . . a recommendation being sent to the Utilities Board, asking that the Board consider issuing an order that will require that acceptable guards be provided to protect above-ground gas services where any of the gas equipment may be subject to damage from vehicle traffic in public thoroughfares, parking areas, and driveways leading to any industrial, commercial, or multi-party residential areas. The question of protection for gas services adjacent to private driveways in single family dwellings is also being surveyed to determine the feasibility of providing similar protection in this area.

And again, I must repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the results of the survey of the incidence of damage to above-ground gas service for the past ten years, shows that there have been 40 reports of such damage out of a total of more than 84,000 services at present in operation.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I was just wondering whether the Honourable First Minister could indicate to us when we could expect the information I requested by way of an Address for Papers with respect to live television for northern Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: This will be provided as soon as we are able to do so. My honourable friend will understand that as his correspondence involves another government, it is necessary to secure their consent. Such process is now under way and we must wait until we hear.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour a question arising out of whose responsibility was it to protect these gas inlets. When the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked you that question, when he brought to your attention the fire in St. Boniface, you said it was a municipal responsibility. Now were you correct in so stating?

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I would refer my honourable friend to the statement I made the day following - I believe it was Friday - indicating where the responsibility was. I might answer my honourable friend too, and tell him that he requested municipal statutes, or statutes indicating municipal responsibility in the installation and control of this equipment and that was the reason I was not able to table it for him, because the statutes are for gas utilities by the Gas Utility Board, and by order of the Board and the Gas Burners and Installers Act. The responsibility for the protection that my honourable friend is asking about is with utility, the utility license inspectors are responsible for the energizing of the service.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Not the gas utility itself, the provincial

MR. BAIZLEY: I am sorry, the Gas Utility.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question on this. Is the Minister suggesting by repeating that there has been so few accidents, that the proper care is being taken? I think we have been quite fortunate.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am just relating the facts to the honourable members of the House.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education with respect to the upgrading courses that are being held throughout the province. Could the Minister tell us who is responsible for the policy regarding eligibility and other related matters. Is it the Provincial Government or the Federal Government?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, through the special programs division of the Department of Education these courses are organized and set into motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: then they operate differently in various provinces. Is this correct? I mean the eligibility might be different in Manitoba than say in Ontario or Quebec or New Brunswick?

MR. JOHNSON: No, I don't believe so. I think anyone who is unemployed or under-employed may apply under regulations which are jointly agreed to between the Federal and the Provincial authorities - under that particular section of the existing agreement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In other words, both governments decide on it. It's a joint decision. Is that correct? Thank you.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, following up on the Minister of Labour's reply on the gas disturbances or breakages. On these 40 reports, would he have a breakdown on how many of these were rural or in the city?

MR. BAIZLEY: 35 were in the Metro area, 5 were rural.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question - I presume it should go to the Provincial Secretary although possibly it's the First Minister. Are all Orders-in-Council published in the Manitoba Gazette?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker. I think that there are regulations which govern which ones are published and which ones are merely filed in the executive office.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to make copies of all the Orders-in-Council available to the Members of the House because it seems to me that these are decisions of government policy and if the members do not get copies there could very well be Orders-in-Council passed that members of the House would not know about.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't believe that would be advisable, Mr. Speaker. We could give it some consideration but I'll give no undertaking at the present.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Has the sewage disposal of Headingly Gaol been modernized so it is not dumping raw sewage in the river?

MR. LYON: I'll have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure who I should direct this question to. Was a Manitoba firm given a contract for the production of the Centennial plates?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think there is an Order for Return out on that general subject in which the information will be brought forward.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer. I was wondering if he could inform the House as to whether or not the loan of a quarter of a million dollars or so that was made to San Antonio Mines a couple of years ago has it been fully recovered without any loss to the taxpayer?

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend will submit an Order for Return I'll try to provide the information.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Attorney-General. What is the present arrangements between the local pound keepers and the law enforcing officers in the City of Winnipeg.

Can the police take custody of the stolen property pending conviction of the person who stole the property or does the person that had the property stolen have to buy it back from the pound keepers?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my honourable friend is asking for a legal opinion which I couldn't give him on Orders of the Day.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. On December 8th the Honourable the Provincial Secretary announced in his White Paper that the orderly payment of debts enabling legislation enacted by the Parliament of Canada will be appropriately adopted to be effective in Manitoba; and then the following day in reply to a question put by the Honourable Member for St. John's, the Honourable Provincial Secretary stated that the only reason for the delay is -- well he stated it's an administrative matter only and obviously this would be implemented, and it's in the hands of the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General inform this House as to what progress he is making with the implementation of legislation that is being provided for, for the Province of Manitoba by the Parliament of Canada in connection with a section of the Bankruptcy Act.

MR. LYON: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, and it is only an understanding - I can check further on it, is that certain regulations pursuant to the Federal Bankruptcy Act must be passed by the Federal Government. These regulations are being worked on at the present time, as I understand it, by federal officials. As soon as that administrative procedure is completed then we can seek to bring those provisions into effect in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General or the Minister of Public Utilities. What is the law in respect to Skidoos and Snowmobiles travelling on public roads? I heard last night that Manitoba leads the field in sales of this particular product. They are becoming very numerous and people are enquiring of me, can they travel in the ditch can they travel on the road or where can they travel?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa perhaps ought to refer to the Statutes - The Highway Traffic Act, and if he does, he will find that there is no provision for licensing them for travelling on public roads.

MR. MOLGAT: the Minister says, refer him to the Act. I think this is a matter of genuine concern on the part of a lot of Manitobans. What is the rule with regard to the ditches? Are these considered in all cases as public roads?

MR. McLEAN: The travelled portion of the public road, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: it is quite in order to inform them that it is quite within the law to travel down the ditch anywhere in Manitoba. They can travel the ditches anywhere in Manitoba, on any road?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa is aware of the rule that legal opinions cannot be given in the House.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a pretty important question because there isn't. . . .

MR. LYON: there is a rule that legal opinions cannot be asked in the House, nor can the answers be given, no matter how desirous we might be of giving an answer to my honourable friend.

MR. HILLHOUSE: legal opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think he was only asking the Minister what the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act were dealing with that particular . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable Member for Gladstone has brought up was, in his mind, a very important matter, but I wonder if it is important enough that the answer should be given at this particular time but rather at another time in more detailed -- growing out of a more detailed discussion on the entire matter. Or does he feel that he should have an answer to his question now?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I don't own a skidoo or a snowmobile but there are a great number of them on the roads and as long as we can rest assured that they're not going to be fined for travelling in the ditches then inquiries that are directed to me I can say that I have been told it is quite in order to travel in the ditches. I would like some kind of an answer on it.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's obvious, if I may attempt to reply to the question, that it is not a matter that can be dealt with on the Orders of the Day. It's too complicated and involved. I think, however, that it would be very desirable if we could produce a statement or a public news release of some kind on this point for the information of the public and we will certainly do our best to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Honourable the First Minister. Eight weeks ago I had an Order for Return passed regarding the purchasing of sandbags for the Winnipeg Flood of last year. Would the First Minister give me an undertaking that this Order will be answered this session.

And while I'm on my feet I would like to direct a similar inquiry to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce regarding an Order for Return asking for details on the amount of money paid to Donald H. Camp and Associates. Can I have an undertaking that this Order will also be answered this session?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of my honourable friend's question, I'm sure he is not aware of the amount of work he has given to the staff in posing his question. It's a very difficult question to answer completely and in detail as he has asked for it. I cannot give him any undertaking as to when it will be answered. All I can say is that we are working on it and as soon as the answer is ready it will be prepared. But I want to stress the fact that he's asked for a lot of information and it's taking a lot of manhours to produce it.

MR. JOHNSTON: If it were not answered this session, Mr. Speaker, could I have the assurance that the answer would be given at a subsequent session?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to inform the members that a short time ago staff in the Department of Public Works designed a new directory, telephone directory, for government departments and offices and the Honourable the Member for Selkirk suggested that members might like to have copies. We have secured some additional ones and they will be distributed to the members, other than to members of the Cabinet who already have them, by the page boys. May I just say two things. This is a looseleaf directory. We urge you to keep the cover for future changes; and secondly there is a sort of an index system in the front but you'll have to insert the pages at the proper places.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for complying with my request and to say that I think it's an excellent job that you've done in respect to that particular index. And I do hope that the government follows the same policy in respect to the Statutes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce would answer my question.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the question.

MR. JOHNSTON: It's regarding an Order for Return with respect to monies paid to Donald Camp and Associates. Will I receive an answer this session?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . friend sure that he knows his question? talking about Donald Campbell? --(Interjection)-- Well now that's different. I do indeed know him. I know him well and favourably and I'm glad to know him and we'll get the answer to my honourable friend as soon as we can.

MR. MOLGAT: Did I understand the First Minister to say he knows Mr. Dalton Camp well and favourably?

MR. ROBLIN: That's true. Just as I know the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker well and favourably. It doesn't take much to amuse some folks.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, we are happy to accept this order subject to just one or two points of clarification to which I wish to make reference at this time.

In the first part of the Order is a reference to temporary housing at Kettle Rapids and we are proceeding on the assumption that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has in mind the main camp at the Kettle Rapids site and in respect of which there were two tenders, as I understand it, by a firm called Atco and another firm named Pearson, so we're proceeding on that basis.

Referring to Section 1 subclause (g) referring to correspondence, we are assuming that this is correspondence relating to the tender and contract prior to the letting of the contract. With respect to paragraph 2, there's an odd situation here because there happens to be in the specifications, so I am informed, two pages 5 and each page 5 has a clause 16 and they are both different. That's an unusual situation but we are proceeding on the assumption that the Member for St. Boniface means the clause, that is the particular clause which refers to a preference for employment of local people. The other clause refers to co-operation with other contractors and I would assume likely that that is not of any significance in this matter.

Then with respect to paragraph 3 of the Order there is a request for information concerning complaints written or oral. We would have to decline the provision of anything concerning oral because we couldn't possibly know what oral, if any, complaints were made; but we can certainly of course comply with the portion with respect to the written complaints, if there were any, they can be provided, but I cannot undertake to provide any information concerning oral discussions or conversations that may have taken place. And subject to those matters, Mr. Speaker, we will be happy indeed to support the motion for the Order.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

(1) How many municipalities are participating in this poisonous bait program to control predators?

(2) How many bait stations were set up in the unorganized territory in the Constituency of Ethelbert Plains?

(3) How many predators permits were issued in 1966

(a) in Manitoba

(b) in Ethelbert Plains Constituency?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to accept this Order subject to being able to provide the information for a Constituency. Our records are not kept by constituencies. I'll do my best to comply with the Order, but I don't undertake to supply the information with respect to item (2) or item (3) (b), although I undertake to do my best.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, to facilitate matters perhaps the district say south of the Riding Mountain National Park would be quite acceptable.

MR. EVANS: I'll try to do it by some appropriate area that may help my honourable friend.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) Cost of stabilized gravel base and shoulders and bituminous surface on Highway No. 5 between Dauphin and Ashville Junction in 1965.
- (2) Cost of stabilized gravel base and shoulders and bituminous surface on Highway No. 5 between Ashville Junction and Gilbert Plains.
- (3) Cost of two road signs advertising the Minister of Highways located between Ashville Junction and Gilbert Plains.

(a) are they rented?

(b) are they owned by the government?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 17. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Could I have this stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate for second reading of Bill No. 22, the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to speak on this debate at the present time and I'm quite prepared to have it go for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it your wish to ask leave of the House to have it stand.

MR. PETURSSON: No, no.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this motion, I would be closing the debate.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if I have the opportunity, I would like to adjourn debate to give it some consideration. I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 24. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): In the absence of our Leader, may we have this matter stand?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that Mr. 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.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

..... continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to start by telling the Minister that we also are interested in hearing more about the Medicare ideas and the Medicare resolution that the government has, and we will wait until this resolution comes up before we discuss this. I had a few remarks that I wanted to direct to the Honourable Member for Inkster, but seeing that he's not here today I'll wait for another occasion.

In answer to the Honourable Member from Wellington, who I believe had his tongue in cheek when he made these remarks about funeral directors, I would like to tell him, in case he was serious, that we are quite pleased - funeral directors being good citizens of Manitoba I think like any other - of the progress that is being made in saving lives. We are not too worried about this, and if by some miracle of some kind the Honourable Member from Wellington could preserve life forever, we wouldn't be too displeased either. We could go in other professions, and I guess some of us might even take up preaching; that seems like a very interesting profession.

Now, I would like to congratulate the Minister for his remarks. I say this very seriously - very sincerely, I think he was at his best. I've never seen him as good as he was, specially yesterday, I don't mean as much as the first day when he introduced, but when he answered the question, I might say to him that he's making it a little more difficult for us here. He wasn't perfect yet though and there's a few things that I think that we could discuss a little further, but he did very well. You can see that he has knowledge of his department, that he's very sincere and very interested in it --(Interjection)-- yes, he's a nice guy although we'd like to cut his salary to \$12,500.

I was pleased by some of the answers. I was very pleased to know that come next year - his estimates next year - we will have at least a partial report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission report. I think that he agrees with us that this is something that certainly - I was going to say was pretty well needed. It would be nice to have the one for this year at this time but at least we can count on next year having at least some partial - some advance information on it.

I'm also very pleased, it's good news indeed to know that the Grace Hospital will announce the opening within 10 days to 2 weeks, and also that he will introduce legislation re grants for Doctor Clinics. But I would like to ask him a question on this. I think that he said that these grants will be accorded these Doctor Clinics only when they are part of a hospital district, and I don't know exactly what he means by that. Does he mean that when there's a hospital in the district, and if so, I would say that I thought that these clinics needed help mostly where there were no hospitals because this was the next best thing. Maybe I didn't understand his remarks and he might clarify this for me.

Now there is a few -- he tried to answer, to talk anyway to cover most of the points I made but he forgot just a few. I wanted to know again - we're talking about building hospitals - what was being done at Deer Lodge. This is a question that I've been asking the last few years and the Minister was supposed to be negotiating with the department of Veterans Affairs to find out how many beds we could have and if we could use this. I understand that some of these beds are not being used and I think that we should make every effort to use what we have now before going out and spending more money.

This is not too important, but I also reminded him to see if we would be ready - I say it's not important, it's always important but it's not a major complaint - that we are ready to receive the athletes and the visitors for Pan Am games here in Manitoba, and this would of course include proper ambulance and so on and information to the visitors that will be coming here in great number I hope.

Now there is a question, a specific question -- there's two specific questions that I wanted and that haven't been answered. I wanted to know -- I mentioned the case of a student 19 years old and over who had been five months in the school, at least in that year, and I was told that the students were exempted but only if the family had a family plan. I made the remark that in a case of a widow with a son attending school she would have a single person plan of course and that would mean, if my information is right, that they would have no exemption, and I would say that this is quite unfair if this is the case and I think that this is certainly -- I can't believe that it was meant to be like that, to help those that might not need help and a person such as a widow with a child who needs all the help in the world would be penalized or would not receive

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . any help, but I would like to have an answer on this. It might be that the information that I was given is wrong.

I also wanted to know if this two year course that was established for the nurses to receive their diploma - and then of course you have the nurses attending university - I wanted to know what credit would be given a student who had finished the three year course and had a diploma - in other words a registered nurse - what credit would she have for the time she put in to study for a diploma. What credit would be given to her if she was to decide to go for her degree? How many more years would she have to attend university, and would this vary for those that finished their three year course and those that will finish a two year course, which I am pleased to believe will be replacing the three year course fairly soon.

I haven't had any answer also for what provision we were making for adequate quarters at the university for the nursing course - for nursing education. Those are the points that he did not cover at all. Now there are other points that he talked about where I feel that we were not given the answers. I asked if there was anything, if the department had a policy about the food, the handling of food in large grocery stores, large chain stores - and I referred especially to the bread that we could see on counters - and I was told that they had inspectors of the City of Winnipeg doing this. Well I knew that. I knew that they had inspectors, but this has been questioned in the past: is this the right thing, is that the healthy thing to do? I think that the responsibility comes to the Department of Health. I would like them to assure the public through me, letting me know if this is perfectly all right, if there is no danger, if the department condones this or if something should be done, if the inspectors of the different cities and municipalities are lax in their duty. This is actually what I wanted to know.

Now the Minister talked about the removal -- I had queried him, I had asked him about removal of lab and X-ray services from private clinics to hospitals and he told me that this was being studied. He did answer this, but it seems to me that this is a request that has been made of the government quite a while ago and it is something that certainly would save money. I know that this is a controversial thing, I know that the owners of the large clinics are not too interested in talking about this, but I think this is something again, that this is something that should be decided by the department, that we should have a little more news or a better answer than I was given on this.

Now I made a suggestion that I considered a very very important one. I suggested that we have the administration of all patient beds under the same roof - under the Manitoba Hospital Commission. The Minister gave me a very informative report of the progress of extended treatment care. He told me that this policy of treatment care had been approved by the doctors and by the University of Manitoba. This was very interesting and I thank him for it, but I think the Minister missed my point completely. I was talking about administration - nothing else - and I thought that this, and I still think, that this is something that would improve matters. I think that we would save beds; I think it would be easier for the Manitoba Hospital Commission to know where they are going. I think that there seems to be a tendency now of building beds, building acute beds, and I think that some of these people are in the hospital -- I know that some of these people are now taking the place of others in the acute beds because they do not want to move. Either there's a waiting list, they can't go to the Sanatorium or St. Joseph's Hospital or Tache, or another very important reason, a very valid reason, once they leave that hospital they'll have to start paying for their own. I'm talking about the administration; I'm not talking about the care, the treatment care. I agree that an awful lot is being done on this and I'm thankful for the Minister giving us this progressive report on that but he's missed the point completely. I'm talking about solely the administration, and I feel that the administration of all these beds should come under the same roof. I think that this would be a very welcome change and I think that this would mean a lot and save an awful lot of money for the people of Manitoba.

Now I've talked about the full time professor of St. Boniface Hospital, and after his answer I was back where I started. The Minister told me that this would be dealt with by the St. Boniface Hospital and the university. I had mentioned this two or three years ago -- I think I've mentioned it twice - and the Minister had answered me -- at the time I had asked him if you had to be from General Hospital to become a full professor and I was told that this wasn't the case. So now I'm told that this will have to be decided by St. Boniface and the university, and I say to him that St. Boniface have already decided, as far they're concerned they would like to have this, they've been asking for this for a long time. But I won't press this any further, I think that I have made my point. If the people were not aware of this, if the Minister

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) was not aware of this then he certainly is now. I know that we've had some changes and it's no use starting by charging discrimination against new people. I know that we have Dean Fyles now as the new Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and I'm sure that this will be arranged to the satisfaction of both. I hope so anyway, but when I say that, I'm talking about the university and the department and the St. Boniface Hospital.

Now the Minister told me to wait to Friday - tomorrow - to discuss the shortage of nurses and he'll be showing me all kinds of reasons why my resolution should not be supported. Well I'd be glad to wait till Friday. I hope that he can but I don't think that he will, but we will be ready, we'll be very interested, and this will also include the personnel shortage of doctors and so on.

He asked me why I had singled out - he didn't ask me why but he made the point that I singled out the Chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission and that I congratulated him. Well, Mr. Chairman, usually when I have something to say I usually say it, and a few years ago I wasn't too happy with the chairman of the commission and I said so. I said so because I felt that he should accept some responsibility, and I must say that from what I understand, from what I read and from what I know, I think that this chairman, who's had a very difficult job - I think it's getting tougher all the time - I think that he hasn't been perfect, there's no doubt about it and he won't be and we don't expect this from him, but he's done a very good job. I think that he's improved the liaison for one thing between the different hospitals and the hospital commission and I think that he's been telling us a little more of what's going on. Of course he still feels that he should keep the secret formula to decide the budget, and I don't agree with him on that, but besides that we're getting quite a bit of information.

I would like to congratulate, if the Minister felt that I wasn't ready to congratulate the other members of the board, this certainly wasn't my intention and I'd like to do so. I think that they also are very dedicated people; I think that they give valuable information - valuable advice to the chairman and to the Minister, and I was certainly very pleased to include them in my congratulations, but I must say to the Minister, when I talked about replacing some of these people - and this is not a reflection on the character of any of these people - but I feel that there is a doctor there that represents the pretty large clinics and I think that we are in danger here, that we could have a conflict of interests. I think that this person has given a lot of good years and I would like to see him replaced by somebody that would be a little more independent, that might not be in a position to maybe being prejudiced - not knowingly, I'm not suggesting that anything is done to help himself or the interest of the large clinics - but I certainly think that it would be better if we did not put a man such as he in a position that he is now. I think there is certainly a danger at least of conflict of interests.

Now the Minister said when I talked about \$70,000 being the cost of a bed, I said it would go to practically \$70,000 in some cases. I must admit that this information I got it only from the Tribune medical critic, Mr. Manfred Jager, who had an article talking about the high cost of beds. He was talking about the Metro - I think it was the Children's Hospital, and after all this is not just the beds, this is all the research and so on, but I think he talked about an addition of 88 beds for \$6,250,000 and he had that figured in this case at \$70,000. The point I was trying to make is that it is not only the bed, there was so much research and education and everything that goes in there, and in this case the bed cost \$70,000. I know that this is not the average and I certainly wasn't trying to suggest that it was. I agree that -- I accept I should say, the Minister's word that it is more between the 30 to \$35,000, maybe \$20,000, for the room and hospital facilities.

Now there was the question of the teaching hospitals. The Minister repeated that this was not an easy matter and I started my remarks about this by saying exactly the same thing. I wasn't trying to embarrass the government or the Manitoba Hospital Association. Now it was reported - it was reported that I had suggested - two days ago or yesterday I think - that I had suggested building a university hospital. Well I don't recall - and I checked Hansard - and I don't recall saying anything that could be connected to that at all, because I don't know. The only thing that I asked the Minister, I said that this was his duty; that he should give a clear-cut policy as soon as possible because the public had a right to know, the doctors had a right to know, the university had a right to know, and I made the same suggestion that I made earlier, that I felt he should take leadership in this.

We have had now for months, a debate, a public debate between certain doctors, the Manitoba Medical Association, certain hospitals and the University of Manitoba, and I don't think that this is right. I would like to see the Minister take the leadership to chair a committee

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) composed of representatives from the university, the different hospitals, the Manitoba Hospital Commission of course, and the Manitoba Medical Society. This is all I'm saying. I'm not making any suggestions because I don't know and I certainly -- you're elected in this House and you don't become an authority from one day to the other, and I know that this is very important - there are two sides. When you take some of these public beds and you make them university beds or teaching beds, you are going to take beds away from the general public and from some of the doctors; you are going to limit the beds that are already too few in numbers to a certain group of doctors. This is serious and it is not right. In this case we are contracting with the people of Manitoba to give them the proper care and then we make it very difficult for them to select their own doctor and so on.

But on the other side, the reasons are just as valid. Where would we be if we had no research and if we could not train the doctors. I could not say to you that we are afraid of a shortage of doctors and then be against any way of getting new doctors. So I recognize that it is quite difficult but I say that we cannot leave it at this; we cannot keep on this public debate forever. I ask the Minister to show leadership and to present the policies of the government and make this public as soon as possible, but I don't say that we should build a university hospital; I don't know enough about it.

We were talking about Medicare and the Minister didn't answer this either. The Manitoba Hospital Commission was supposed to study the effect of Medicare with this new plan, this plan that came in on the facilities we have here. I hope this report of this study will be made available when we discuss this resolution that the government -- or legislation they are bringing in on Medicare.

There is the question of the hospital for the north end. I think the Minister was quite charitable yesterday. He took all the blame. He said that he made a few remarks here and everybody jumped on him. Well that's not quite true. I was the one that asked him that about three years ago or so, one of the first ones that brought it in the House and I was joined by the Member for Elmwood at the time, Mr. Peters, who was quite interested. And the first - I was checking Hansard yesterday - the Minister said he could not give me an answer, and it was only one or two days after this that he did get a note from some of his advisors and he pulled no punches then. He said there was no need - there was no need for a hospital there at all, and he quoted experts saying that this was the case. And he also said, if I remember right, that he lived on the other side of West Kildonan - I think it was Petula or something, at the corner of the street, I'm not sure - and that it took him 15 minutes to drive to General Hospital under ordinary conditions and that he could make it in less than 15 minutes in an emergency, so therefore they said there wouldn't be any hospital at all.

Now the part that I dislike, and this statement was repeated - I had a clipping from the chairman of the commission - sometime last summer this was repeated, but then just before or around election time all of a sudden we were going to have a hospital in the north end, and I think this is probably what the member was -- one of the members anyway that said they had to have pressure to make them act - he was talking about pressure anyway - and is this pressure from the City Council. Now I would like to see a hospital in the north end and I think there is a need for one. If we are going to build -- this is on condition of course of needing the beds, but I think that the Minister was, as I say, too charitable there. He was taking the blame for somebody else because this wasn't his decision. I agree though that he must take the responsibility. He has to take the credit for all the good things they do; he must take the responsibility also when they are wrong. Maybe I am wrong, maybe the government was responsible, this was, as I said, this was around election time. Maybe they had a change of policy and told the experts what they wanted. I'm not making an accusation, I am just suggesting that it kind of looks funny that we hear there is no need - we get all the experts telling us there is no need - and all of a sudden around election time the next thing that is going to come up and all the candidates, it was mentioned yesterday, they all want a hospital in the north end.

Now there was another thing. I mentioned the weekend use of the hospitals. We have talked about all this high cost of beds, building hospitals, new beds needed. Now quite a few years ago there was a group, a delegation that left from Manitoba to go out and study a certain hospital that was trying to bring in six days and seven days for the operating rooms and the labs and so on and there was an improvement made, but we are certainly not going fast enough on this. My honourable friend is going to tell me tomorrow why we have no shortage of nurses and I say that this is directly - directly the cause of shortage of personnel, shortage of nurses;

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . and this is something that has not been hidden, this is something that has been claimed by the experts, by the commission and by the doctors and by the hospitals, that we could not do this, we could not have the full capacity of these hospitals during the weekends because we haven't got the personnel and the nurses, and I say that if he stops for a minute and thinks how many beds and how many dollars, thousands of dollars, millions of dollars we would save if we could have these beds. Now the chairman of the commission stated himself that this experiment really never got off the ground. Why? Because the doctors were not interested and of course we just didn't have the nurses to supply these extra days - and we'll talk again about the shortage of nurses - but then the medical profession was not interested. Well I think if this is the case, they'll just have to be interested. We have quite a few of the members of the medical profession who complain because of the shortage of beds and they could not get their patients in, and I think that it would be a good idea if we can't have -- this would be besides the emergencies, but I think that we should do an effort to push this even if, as I said, even if we can't get the nurses, if we have to offer extra pay for this I think it would be worth it.

I think the statement made by the supervisor of this hospital in the States, the Cooper Hospital in Camden, New Jersey, I think he made the statement that it was time to put an end to the historically understandable but arbitrary and unfortunate connection between five days a week and the new service required in the hospital. He certainly claims that they have saved an awful lot of money on this. He figures that they eliminate the pile-up that would result from closing the hospitals - not really closing, but the operating rooms for instance on the weekend - and what happens on Monday? He talks about slowing down for Friday, so it disturbs the hospitals on Mondays and Fridays besides not being used on Saturdays and Sundays.

Well there was an important thing that was mentioned, probably the most important thing that was mentioned was the question of budgets, and the Minister did not say one word on this, not one word. Now he told us in 1965, in answer to one of my questions, he said he would like to make a few comments when he was on his feet on the matter of standard in hospitals. "The Honourable Member for St. Boniface mentioned that he recognized the commission have a responsibility to determine policies which will assure that available funds are distributed equitably and justly to all Manitoba hospitals." I won't read this, but this is in Hansard of 1965 Page 1390, where the Honourable Minister tells us all about the standards that we must have in the hospitals. It was spelled out that we could get this information from the commission and he was talking also about the experience that the commission and the budget committee had on such things, the 7 or 8 years that they had in different hospitals. Well I imagine that they still have this experience plus two more years because this was in 1965, but now the Minister made a -- he talked about budget before but he did not answer my question, and he said that we should have a cut, that the hospitals are asking for a 20% increase and that it would be cut to 10%. Now this is an odd thing to do, make a statement in the House here while there is still an appeal going on. I understand that it is difficult enough for these hospitals to bring in an appeal. They have to have their budget in to the commission - the budget committee - about three months before; it is kept for about three months and then they have little better than two weeks to bring in a written appeal to the commission, which is practically impossible. And during this time the Minister helped things a little more by telling us that the increase will be cut down to 10%.

Now I think we must remember that this 20% increase was 20% increase over the accepted - the accepted budget, approved budget I should say of last year, but isn't it a fact -- this is a question I would like to ask the Minister: What was the deficit of all the hospitals? Isn't it about a million and a half? I'd like to get the amount of all the hospitals. Well if it's going to be only a 10% increase and if this has to cover the deficit, what will this be - roughly 5% increase.

Now the Minister I think was not quite fair when he made the statement, and he was basing himself on this, that we hadn't increased the per day patient care at the hospitals. This is true but this is not representing things the way they are at all. I think that this is wrong because things have changed. Take the hospitals now as - you might say the services they give - there's four different kinds. They have the in-patient care; the out-patient department; the referred-in procedure lab, a procedure which is the lab mostly such as the study of cancer, study of cytology and so on which has been done by the General and St. Boniface Hospitals for the last few years; and also there is the home care.

Now what service in these last three categories that were covered by the plan before 1959, because this is the year they talked about, 1959. I would ask the Honourable Minister to give

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) me what was spent in these three categories in 1959 and 1966 and what he expects to spend in 1967. For instance, in 1961 the operating costs of the Manitoba Cancer Research came under this plan. This was in 1961. I'd like to have the cost of this for the 1959 - of course there wasn't any in 1959 - and 1961 and 1966. Now what about home care? That started I think at the General Hospital around 1958 and at the Children's and St. Boniface around 1964. What was the cost of that, the home care for 1966. And as I say, what about this cytology? This was started at General and St. Boniface only in 1963. What was the cost of this?

And besides, isn't it a fact that we have more specialized services? How much, for instance, what heart surgery was performed in the province in 1959 compared to 1966. I think if the Honourable Minister would take his supplement to the annual report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission of 1965 and open it at Page 31, Figure No. 6, this graph there, it's got insured out-patient claims. It's got for 1959, insured treatment, \$40,000 and it climbs in 1965 to about \$85,000. That's more than double. Emergency diagnoses the same thing, and all other designated procedure. We have a list also - this is in the supplement - but the Annual Report of 1965 of the Manitoba Hospital Commission in the last page - and he was very proud to show us this last year, to talk about this, and he should be - there is a list of insured out-patient services as of December 31st, 1965 and there's two pages. Well is it fair for the Minister to come in and say the hospitals are spending too much money and they haven't done anything? He didn't say that but this is what one would believe if he just listened to his statement that there weren't more per day - what did he call that - the care per patient per day. Well I think that the hospital does an awful lot more than that now.

Now some of these things were imposed on the hospitals by the government - most of them. They didn't ask for this. They were told to do it and they are not even getting the money that it costs to provide these services. Therefore, it only stands to reason that the cost of the hospital is going to rise, it's going to go up, but I think that this is something that we're bound to expect, and as I say, this again is something difficult. This is not something that you can just criticize; this is something that I know they are doing everything they can, but I don't think that it's good enough to say that we're going to reduce the increase by \$10,000 including the deficit - including the deficit, without studying all these things. If you're going to do this you're going to reduce and you're building more beds. Because of this you might not use these beds.

A few years ago I think that some of the things were not covered under the plan. If you had a hangnail you'd go to the - if you didn't want to pay - you'd go to the hospital. Well now it's covered and you don't have to do this. So I say to the Minister that some of these people, certainly some of them would just go to the doctor's office but others would meet the doctor halfway. Now they can meet him halfway and go to the emergency ward in the hospital and get this done and this is covered, where before some of them might say, "Well I'll go to the hospital and it will all be paid for by the Hospital Commission - Hospital Plan." So I think that this would give us more of the true picture.

Well I think that this is very important because it's not just a question of cutting - cutting down - reducing the amount spent by the hospitals. I think that you can't look at building more beds, increasing the beds, acute care, without looking at your budget. I think you've got to decide how much money you have and you've got to decide what you want and it would be completely wrong and ridiculous to start going backwards because this is what the hospitals are saying, and certainly they have the same experience, more experience than they had before, and all of them -- I'm certain that these people are not doubting the sincerity of the Manitoba Hospital Commission, I'm not doubting the sincerity of the Minister, but I'm not doubting either the sincerity of the administrator of these hospitals and they say that they will have to cut down on services if this is the case.

Well again we must have a policy. I think that probably it's possible. Now there's certain things that are It's terrific to go to the hospital and have somebody coming around every day to show you the menu and ask you what you want --(Interjection)-- No, this is done and I say this is terrific, but this is where we're going to start cutting on some of these luxuries and this is why I was talking about deterrents or utilization fee - and I'll talk about this again - because we can't just take the easy way out, just spend and spend and where will the money come from. I think that the Minister will have to make up his mind on this question of budget. This is something that will be under review all the time but I think maybe we're going a little too fast. You'll have to make up your mind if you want more beds

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) or if you want to give the service and utilize what you have now, provide for the proper personnel and provide for the funds to do the work that you've already started in these hospitals. It's no use, as I said before, to build these hospitals, to approve new X-ray machines for \$300,000 and then cut down the technician that's supposed to operate these machines. I know this is not the intention of the Minister or the plan, but I think that this will have to be looked at. Now as I said, this is very difficult. This is a very difficult thing to do and I said that the problems of this department is the shortages, the shortage of nursing personnel; we'll talk about this some more; the shortage of beds and the shortage of money.

And I'm coming back now to pretty well the end of what I want to say today, the question of deterrents. Well I think I made one mistake when I suggested this. I should have called it by other names also. Deterrent doesn't sound as good as utilization fee or co-insurance, and this is what it should be. Oh, I know, I admitted that this was not popular, that I wouldn't win any popularity contest by suggesting this deterrent, but I think that we have to start thinking about these things. I think we have proven now, we have shown that we have a shortage of money and I would -- the Honourable Member from Inkster talked about premiums. Last year I suggested that we do away with premiums when we brought this in and this is what I think we should do, I think we should do away with premiums when we bring in this utilization fee.

But I do not agree with the Minister that this will not get rid of some of the people in the hospital and I certainly do not agree with the member from Inkster, who said yesterday -- I think this is a statement that doesn't mean anything, to say, "I have confidence in the people in this House and I have just as much confidence in the people outside this House. If we don't abuse the privilege of the hospital inside here, nobody outside does." Well this is ridiculous. Maybe there are some inside that would abuse. I say it's the same thing to say, well there's nobody that is convicted for robbery in the House so there's nobody convicted for robbery outside the House. We have freeloaders; there's no doubt about that. I'm not talking about the people in general but we do have freeloaders. We have people that will stay in the hospital because they get excellent service and it is a good rest. It's good for them but they are taking the place of somebody else and I say that you have to look at this utilization fee; you have to look at this co-insurance. You have this for your cars -- that's wrong -- especially if we remove the premiums. What happens now? Is it wrong that we should have utilization fee that we should pay for part, a small part of the care that we are receiving? We pay through our tax -- income tax -- federally and provincially we pay for this hospital plan. We pay for it, and we will pay for it when you bring in your sales tax. We pay for it even in municipal tax because the municipality provides 20 per cent of the construction grant. So I'm asking that maybe we should bring in the utilization fee and I'm not ashamed of that.

What have we got here, this hospitalization plan. Is it a right or a privilege? We are trying to tell the people of Manitoba that it is a right. But what is it in fact? It's privilege for some, and we're talking as if I'm trying to destroy something or hurt people because I'm suggesting that some of them should leave the hospital a little sooner. We've had an example -- we had a flood or a scare of a flood not long ago -- they sure emptied that hospital in a hurry. I say that there's some people that should not be in those beds. This is not blaming anybody, but I say that it might serve as a deterrent. It certainly will serve as a utilization fee in co-insurance and there's nothing wrong with that, with somebody paying for a little bit of what they're receiving, especially if they have no premiums. That's another way. We're talking about we're paying through our premiums besides all the taxes now, and how many people have never even seen the inside of a hospital. We cannot provide -- these people have a contract, we have a contract with them, if they can't pay their premiums they go to jail but we can't give them a bed. The waiting list is big and a few years ago it was 1,700, last year about 3,000 by some of the figures that I have, and now it's about 3,800. Am I so wrong in saying that the people in the hospitals should be ready to pay for part of the service they're getting? What happened to the

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Would the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, certainly.

MR. DOERN: I just wanted to ask you the following. A lot of these people it seems that you're talking about who go to hospitals really don't require or really aren't sick, but aren't a lot of these people you're talking about what you might call hypochondriac people who have certain problems. I mean, do you not regard these people as sick, or do you think that just by

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) keeping them out of the hospital this is doing a service.

MR. DESJARDINS: If we've got to build a bed for every hypochondriac it will be quite costly. I did not say that there are a lot of people in the hospitals, that go to the hospitals that are not sick. I'm suggesting that some are over-staying, and I'm saying that for the emergency - and there are emergencies for the 3,800 people that are waiting on the waiting list - some of them are staying there. In fact when we were talking about what the people do it's been -- they've had a survey, I think it was at General Hospital a few years ago, that the people who were admitted on the week-end, their average stay was three days more than the people that were admitted on another day, and that the people like to be discharged on a Saturday. There's a lot more people leaving the hospital on a Saturday and I've heard the other way. A doctor that said to a mother, "Well don't go home on Friday, the kids are home from school and you'll be tired." I'm not saying this is not good, but we have more people waiting and if they want this little extra, I say that it is not wrong to charge them. They're not paying for anything else.

There's people now up in the north, they have no hospital, they are helping to pay this plan through their premiums, the federal and provincial income tax, the sales tax, and they never see the inside of a hospital. I'm not suggesting anything cruel when I say that those that are there and they're treated like kings, and you know if you've been in the hospital the service that you get. They run around with the menus; they don't do that at my house. I eat what's on the table, but when I go in the hospital I have a choice. And this is good, but why can't we pay a little bit more, especially when we need so many more hospitals

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, if its all right with the Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Is the decision of a person staying in a hospital his decision or his doctor's, because perhaps we should be after the doctors. I mean who decides? Do you just say I want to stay an extra three days and the doctor agrees? Isn't this your doctor's decision?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I hate to intervene, but I think it would be best if we allowed the member to make his statement and then my honourable friend could perhaps make a statement himself which would argue the point that he's trying to make.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think that this would be the best way to proceed but I'll try to answer this last question. Who decides? I think that some time the only one that knows is the patient. And these doctors being human, but then of the relationship, of the liaison or the friendship between the patient and the doctor -- and it's quite difficult for a doctor to say, when you say I'd like to stay an extra day, it's quite difficult at times to say no, you get out. The administration doesn't know anything about it. You'd have to have a it was suggested and you're not going to start going around to make that much of a survey. We were told yesterday that we trust the people of Manitoba. The Minister said that it wouldn't be a deterrent, I don't agree with him. He also mentioned that you have semi-private and that is not a deterrent. That is a deterrent. When you get everything free why aren't you going to take it? There's not too many people that will not take something when it's free. At least you'll have to grant me that you'll be tempted to accept something if it's free, but if you have to pay, a little bit, a share of it, well it's not the same thing. And I say that it will act as a deterrent, maybe not exactly as much as I think, I think that it will quite a bit and if not this fee becomes a utilization fee and there's nothing wrong with that. So I would ask the Minister to think of this suggestion again because I think this is something we will have to have pretty soon.

It was Dr. Saunders, I think, of General Hospital that was talking about the pattern of procedure of the people and it wasn't laid down, it wasn't only the physician it was just these people would prefer being discharged on a Saturday and I think that we have had a -- now because of the weekend the doctor, this is another thing, the doctor will say, well all right we don't need the beds on the weekend because they're not admitting people maybe on Sunday but they don't need the beds on Friday because the operating room is closed on Saturday and Sunday.

I want to conclude now, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say to the Minister that this is not really criticizing, I think that I said before, that I understand that there's a lot of politics but in the field of health I don't think that we should play too much politics, if any, and I think that we all recognize that no matter, I can say that there's shortage of personnel and so on, we'll never get enough. We know that. And it'll always cost a lot of money for these beds and it is

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) a problem that we must all face not only the government or the liberal party or the NDP, its something that we've got to try together so this is what, I tried to be constructive in my remarks. I hope that we will look at this, especially these two points of bringing all the administration under the same roof, I think this is going to help a lot; this business of using the beds as much as possible, to be careful before we start building any other beds and new hospitals that we are not going backwards in the existing hospital, that we're not going to cut their efficiency and also because there's a shortage of money because it's too costly that we should try to bring -- I also mentioned the question of sweepstakes, I know this is not too popular with some people but when you're talking about either this or cut down on the service, the hospital plan for the people of Manitoba, I think that we have to take these tough decisions, we can't just think of being popular and we must look at deterrents as utilization fees and co-insurance and sweepstakes and all these things. So I would leave the Minister with these remarks.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there are just two or three comments that I'd like to make. A couple of them dealing with the remarks that we have just heard from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The honourable member speaks of a deterrent fee as one which may tend to reduce the number of patients in hospitals; and he also refers to the fact that surveys show that the length of stay of patients is gradually increasing.

However, I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that these same surveys do not in any way indicate any abuse of the hospital services offered. I would suggest to you that all of these surveys show is not that there are people making extensive use of the hospital services presently available but they simply indicate that in times in the past people did not make sufficient use of the hospital services, which is something quite different. Health reports and surveys of the state of health of our province do indicate that there was a time when there was inadequate hospitalization services provided for the people. So I would hope that more people would avail themselves of the services available to them. But this is not necessarily indicative of any abuse; and I further suggest to you that if there is any abuse -- and if there is, I suggest that the Minister do inquire into it and I would hope that he recognizes that as one of his responsibilities -- but if there is, then certainly a deterrent fee is not a corrective measure, no more than a deterrent fee would be a corrective measure of abuses that may prevail in our education system.

There may be abuses within the education system but we do have other ways and means of correcting them, ways other than imposing a deterrent fee. Because if we impose a deterrent fee, Mr. Chairman, then we are behaving contrary to the intent of the hospitalization plan which we have instituted in this province. The intent, the purpose of the hospitalization plan is to spread the cost of hospitalization services over the entire population of the province. This would be a step away from it, and if we were to take this one step, who knows, the following year the government may decide to take another step and a third and a fourth and in a number of years we may be back in the same position that we were at some years ago, the position which we deplored, the position that we wish to move away from.

I would also like to comment briefly on the matter of a hospital in the north end of Winnipeg. I'm glad that the Province of Manitoba is presently discussing this matter with the City of Winnipeg. The Honourable Minister mentioned that there are many factors to be considered, population and such, and I agree that these are very very important factors. There's one other factor which he did not mention, I would hope that he is mindful of it, and that is that the City of Winnipeg is divided into about five areas somewhat isolated from each other by geographical barriers and others, railway tracks and such. We have the downtown area bounded by railway tracks on the north and a river to the south and east. We have the north end of Winnipeg, a river on one side and the tracks on the south -- and that one corner of metropolitan Winnipeg is removed from quick and ready accessibility to hospitals because there are only four or five avenues of approach, Main Street, Salter, Arlington and McPhillips, the other one over on Keewatin which is some distance removed. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if any one of those avenues of travel are blocked, whether it be due to weather conditions or a parade as we often have on Main Street in the summer time, this does create traffic congestions on the other arteries and does slow up traffic and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the ambulances may blow their sirens as long and as loud as they wish but it would not speed up the moving of the ambulance because of the heavy traffic moving both ways.

This, Mr. Chairman, leads me to the last point and the most important one that I would like to make today, in connection with this matter. And that is one of ambulance services and

(MR. HANUSCHAK, cont'd)....facilities. I gather from reading the report that there are areas of Manitoba wherein ambulance services are not adequate, perhaps even most inadequate. The people of metropolitan Winnipeg are not satisfied with the ambulance services that they offer. Now I suggest to you that there's an inconsistency here, there's an inconsistency with the philosophy underlying the provision of hospitalization services if we say that we the Province of Manitoba are making hospital services available to all, provided that the patient can find his way to the hospital door -- and this in effect is what we are saying Mr. Chairman, by not providing a publicly owned ambulance service for the people of the Province of Manitoba. The transportation of the patient to the hospital is a vital part of the service that the hospital offers.

Now yesterday, or the day before yesterday, we were treated to a lecture by the Honourable Member from Churchill on the virtues of a free enterprise system, but it's strange, Mr. Chairman, but it's strange that the free enterprise system has not seen fit to implement an adequate ambulance service to meet the needs of the people of Manitoba. And the explanation for it is quite simple, that the needs are varied, that the types of facilities and services that an ambulance operator ought to provide are so varied that it makes it impractical for anyone ambulance operator to undertake and provide for the people in his community. This is not a type of service wherein there's any need for competition. When one is in need of an ambulance one does not go searching for the cheapest ambulance or the fastest ambulance or the most comfortable ambulance; one wants an ambulance to get the patient from wherever he may be at the time he suffers his injury to the nearest place where he can obtain medical service and medical attention.

This I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is a responsibility that the province should undertake. And if the province undertakes this responsibility, then -- and it is the only body that is capable of providing the people of Manitoba with adequate and proper ambulance services, because there is need, there's need for adequate ambulance service as we now have it in the form of motor vehicles, there's need for air ambulance service, there's need for water ambulance service, we also have snow storms from time to time during the winter season in this province and there is need to provide vehicles that are capable of travelling over the snow blocked highways to get patients to hospitals. This is a type of service that should be provided for the people of Manitoba and I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister of Health would take this matter into consideration and that sometime during the course of this session the Minister would see his way clear to make some announcement to the people of Manitoba that this matter will be considered and looked upon favorably.

I would also like to hear from the Minister -- and I have no doubt that he has, done this -- I would like to know whether he has studied any publicly owned ambulance service plan. There are publicly owned ambulance service plans in existence in this world and I would like to know whether he has studied them; and if he has studied them, I would like to hear the Honourable Minister's comments on the effectiveness of their operation, because as I said before, the transportation of the patient to the hospital is an integral part of the hospital service and this therefore, should be provided for by the people of Manitoba, at large by the Province of Manitoba.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the opportunity hasn't presented itself so far that I could take part in this debate under the Health Department and I would like to make a few comments at this particular time.

In listening to the debate this afternoon and the contribution made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, in discussing deterrent fees, I would only add that I would be heartily in support of some measure whereby costs could be shared - this could be done I think probably on a very small basis. I know some of the provinces have fees that they charge of \$1.00 per day or so for those people who are in hospital, and certainly there is nothing wrong with this. The people that are using the beds, this is not an amount that really will hurt them, and at the same time if it does act as a deterrent and does provide the beds for those people that need them very badly, where you have waiting lists, I think this is quite in order and I would certainly support such a program.

Now I had a few other matters that I wish to dwell on. One has to do with the matter of water treatment. We find in the report that has been placed before us, some comments on page 94 of the report in connection with treatment of water supplies by the various locals under the Water Supply Board and I would like to know from the Minister to what extent does the department

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) supervise this. We have some locations that draw their water from wells, others get their water from other supplies and are these waters that are being used through the system, first tested by the department, and do they specify as to the amount and the strength of treatment that can be given to that particular supply? Because when going to the various parts of this province and you taste the water of that particular system, some of them are so bad you can hardly drink it and I am just wondering whether they are not putting far too much into this supply so that they are going beyond the rates and the scope, if there is a limitation placed by the Department for this purpose, and certainly I'll be very happy to hear from the Minister concerned on this matter.

Then mention has been made that there will be a change of the reports from the calendar year to the fiscal year. Does this mean that we will at our next session, more or less consider the same report that is before us now except that it will be extended to March 31st of this current year? I don't know whether I would welcome this at all. I think the more current we can have our reports the better and certainly I would like to see them remain on a calendar year basis, at least the reports that we do consider, otherwise if we go to the fiscal years, that would mean that we would be dealing with this same report next year and on any new proposals we would be dealing for the coming year at that particular time. I hope the Minister gives this consideration and certainly that we will be able to deal with the old current situation at the time.

I would like to also mention to the House and members of this House, that the government is presently in the process, and has been for some time, in constructing a health centre which is named the Eden Mental Health Centre at Winkler, Manitoba. Building has gone on and I think it is almost to completion and mention is made in the report of this matter on page 40. I certainly appreciate the government going into this new type of service where they are decentralizing the matter of mental health centres and certainly he has all the support of the community, not only of the local community, but a large group of people of the whole Province of Manitoba in support of this project. They have taken on themselves to place a levy on the various church organizations in order to put up the initial amount, the 20 , or is it 25% that they have to put up in order to get the Institution built.

I wish that the Minister would correct me or tell me the exact amount, whether it is also 20% as is presently being levied when the new hospital is built and whether that same rate applies to this Mental Health Centre. I think originally they requested 25 percent but maybe this has been changed to 20 percent. At any rate, I certainly would congratulate the Minister and the Government on this project and on this experiment. I am sure that the people of this province and the people that are connected with this will give their wholehearted support on this very project.

In connection with hospital grants we find on page 9 of the report is a list of the various contributions that the Federal Government has made to the various hospitals constructed and I am wondering what is the ratio. Is it still as it used to be and does this 20-80 percent still apply? If there is any change in this, I would certainly like to hear from the Minister on this, so that he could bring us up to date.

We have already been informed in this House that a measure will be coming forward in connection with the Denturists and I would certainly be very interested if the Minister brought us up to date on the picture of the dentists in this province. Are we improving the situation, because many centres in rural Manitoba are so short of dentists and I would like to know from the Minister whether there is any improvement in this general area.

The matter of Medicare has already been mentioned in this House and I think as already indicated the Minister will be making a full statement on this. I would like to know when the Minister is making his report, are we going to join the compulsory or mandatory program as set out by the Federal Government earlier last year or have any changes been made in the requirements. Certainly I don't agree with any compulsory plan of that nature. Certainly provinces made requests to have this changed, whether any amendments have been made I am not aware of the current situation, but certainly I would be most anxious to hear from the Minister on this point as well.

Thank you.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question regarding a foundry which is situated in my constituency namely Prairie Foundry. For about the past ten years people in my constituency have approached various levels of government and have complained about the - well the problems of air pollution in the neighborhood. They complained I think before the foundry was built and after it was built and in production and so on; they have been complaining ever since. They complain about dirty laundry, about smoke, cinders and so on. Some tests have been made out there. I have heard a description of these tests, something about little containers and so on, milk shake containers being nailed up on telephone poles and checked later on. I don't know how one tests for air pollution but if the description of my constituents is correct, it didn't sound too scientific. I know there have been some studies made on this and so on.

The residents also complain that this foundry is depreciating their land values. I know that a few years ago they closed it down. They had a filter installed which cost a considerable amount of money but the residents of the area still say that as far as they are concerned, this filter is of no use. They say it is just as bad as it ever was. So I don't think the people of the area want this foundry closed in the sense that they don't want to create unemployment, but I think they do want the pollution problem corrected and I think that if the foundry cannot adequately prevent air pollution it should be closed. I don't advocate that, but if that's the only alternative, then it will have to be closed. But the more sensible alternative is that the Minister should have his officials check the efficiency of the filter and the system. If the system can be improved and if what these people say is true, it looks like it should be improved, then some additional equipment should be installed.

So I ask the Minister -- I am sure he is familiar with this -- I ask him what is he doing and what does he propose to do to correct this problem of the Prairie Foundry in Elmwood constituency.

MR. PETURSSON: I wonder if you would permit me just to say a word or two, I haven't much to say at this time. I felt rather deeply moved on the earlier occasion when the Minister was complaining to his boss about the difficulties he had in getting away to catch pickerel up north of Flin Flon. It seems that that is probably the distance that we now have to go to get good fish from clean water, and I hope that the Honourable the First Minister will be more lenient with him on other occasions and give him a little extra time to get away. I know that the Health Department is a very large department, as I recognized the other day, and the duties heavy and arduous and they take much time, and it covers much territory. That's why I'm going off into another area than what the Honourable Member from St. Boniface was covering.

I would wish if I may, and with all due deference, remind the Minister of Health that my constituency is Wellington and not Logan. I have very great respect for the Member from Logan and much appreciation for the people in the constituency of Logan, but I like my constituency better and would remind the Honourable Minister that's where I come from.

Now in his reference to the fish disappearing both in the Winnipeg River up near Pine Falls and at the mouth of the River, and in other places because of the use of what he called illegal nets - small mesh nets - illegal nets or from as a result of poaching. I can't help but feel that the Honourable Minister must have been kidding, either that or casting reflections on some other department of government whose duty is to see that the legal size nets are used and that poaching is not practised. If the illegal nets were used to such an extent that they depleted the fish and the river, then whatever department happens to be in charge of that area must certainly have been sound asleep and I would ask the Honourable Minister to chastise them, remind them of what they are supposed to be doing. They can't possibly be working as hard as he is at his job.

Now the Minister said that it was due to poaching and illegal mesh in fish nets, and he quoted a source which is reported in Hansard as having said that "fish swim around pollution the same as we walk around garbage; it's small mesh nets which kills off fish more than pollution." Now there are innumerable authorities, most of them in the States and increasing numbers in Canada, that insist that it is pollution that is killing off the fish and despoiling the waters in our fair land. Canada is 100 years old, and in a hundred years it has succeeded in so polluting many of our streams and lakes that they are getting to be almost unusable.

Now I have a statement, it's written by a man who has made a special study of pollution, an American, a former Governor of the State of Wisconsin, at the present time a United States Senator from Wisconsin, Gaylord A. Nelson, and he has written an article in a publication -- is it required that I name the publication? It's called "The Progressive". It is published in

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd).... Wisconsin and he is describing the condition of streams and lakes in his State and in other parts of the country and he makes reference to Lake Erie, to which I referred and to which the Honourable Minister also referred the other day. Among other things that he says is this statement, "A recent survey of twelve major river basins in southeastern Wisconsin found not a single one fit even for the partial body contact involved in fishing or wading." And he said further, "A competent governmental agency concluded that 754 miles of rivers in this region had been turned into open sewers", and he goes on to describe some of these streams.

But then he gets to the subject of Lake Erie and he says, "National attention has been centred on once beautiful Lake Erie, the great lake which is the recreational front yard of Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo and Detroit, and which supplies water for ten million Americans, supplies water for drinking purposes", and he says, "A public health service survey of Lake Erie made the shocking discovery that in the 2,600 square mile heart of the lake there was no dissolved oxygen at all in the water. The lake in this vast area could support no desirable aquatic life, only lowly creatures such as blood worms, sludge worms, sow bugs and blood-suckers." Then he goes on, he says, "Lake Erie is a product of its tributaries. A public health survey study of these American sewers is horrifying to read," and I'll spare the House the horrible details. It isn't very pleasant reading because it shows here in one place that a river that is so completely polluted that there is no life in it other than the kind of life that he describes as existing in Lake Erie exists in these rivers.

For instance, he says, "In the Cleveland Harbour the public health service could find virtually no conventional aquatic life, however, the sludge worms which thrive on organic matter were well represented, 400 thousand per square metre in the Harbour bottom." Then he goes on to Lake Erie, and we are interested in Lake Erie because it is a Canadian lake as well as an American. He says, "The experience in Lake Erie, Lake Michigan and Green Bay has convinced many experts of this chilling fact, it is a definite possibility that the Great Lakes, the greatest single source of fresh water in the world, could be effectively destroyed by pollution in the years ahead. If this were to happen it would be the greatest natural resource disaster in modern history."

Then he goes on to deal with municipal sewage, industrial pollution, septic tanks, pesticides and so on. And he says in one place here, "One part of DDT and one billion parts of water will kill blue crabs in eight days." He talks about silt, he talks about detergents, fertilizers and other chemicals, and some of these other commonly used substances, and he says, as a result of his findings and statements that he has made, he says, "We must make the war on pollution a high priority matter at every level of government - local, state and federal - and we must insist that private industry do the same." And in one of the concluding statements near the end he says, "The staggering problem of industrial pollution is virtually untouched today" - and he refers to the Federal Government - he says, "by our federal anti-pollution programs, even though industry contributes twice as much pollution to our waters as do the municipalities." And I imagine that what holds for the States holds also for Canada, because even though some people may think or believe or maintain that something is being done towards the solution of the pollution problem, it is in effect very minimal.

I would wish to add something which is a little closer to home, taken from local clippings. There was one article, a rather long column taken from the Free Press early in the year, November 2nd late in last year, talking about the Red River pollution as being serious; and there's another one here, "Target, Pollution Control;" and one statement in another rather lengthy report says that "Ralph Hedlin, a Winnipeg economist" - this is from the Tribune, November 4th - "Ralph Hedlin, a Winnipeg economist said it is wrong for someone whose factory uses a river and pollutes it at the expense of society to be in business, but time must be given to industry to adjust its operations." I wonder just how much time, because many of these industries have been in business for quite some long time and it is because of them that the waters and the rivers and the lakes are reaching the point that they have.

On January 30th, just a few days ago, an article appeared in the Tribune written by James Gray. It's called, "Dirtying Our Air and Our Water," and there it is stated, "A wild-life biologist has accused both the City of Saskatoon and the newly located chemical companies of contaminating the river." - That's the Saskatchewan River of course. "The extent of the pollution of the Saskatchewan can be gauged by the fact that contamination of the water is measurable seventy miles downstream and it's all flowing in our direction. We are at the bottom end of this big drainage basin. Saskatoon, although it's a growing city and already having

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) reached pretty large proportions, Saskatoon does not have a full treatment plant for its sewage, so it has a facility for chopping it before it goes into the river."

And then it goes on speaking of Calgary and we get the - it seems the polite word for it is "effluent" - it's sewage in any language. "The Calgary Oil Refineries have ruined fishing in the Bow River for many miles downstream" - and I don't think they've ever used small mesh nets in the Bow River. "Tourists who wet a line east of the city and haul in a rainbow trout or two get a bilious surprise when they get a taste of their catch." And yet it says in the concluding words of this particular article, "As yet," it says, "there is no general outcry against either air or water pollution. Industrial smokestacks belch their contaminants upwards unimpeded; rivers are made to dump refuse in." And the attitude is well summed up by the Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Commission. He said, "Water is for use and if some of it gets polluted in the process the people should try to live with it."

Not very long ago a statement was made by a biologist in the United States that if pollution continued at the present rate, that within another hundred years people who were not only not being able to live with it, they would have failed and we would all be dead. It's that serious.

Now pollution isn't a local problem, it isn't a local or a land problem; it's a problem that is worldwide, and people are not being concerned only about lakes or rivers being polluted, they are now being concerned about the oceans being polluted. I have a report here - this is a transcribed radio address and it would serve little purpose in reading it because it's written in a language that few of the members in the House have been educated to read or understand. I can pass the publication on to the Minister of Health and ask the Minister of Education to translate it for him; it's written in good Icelandic. And here they are dealing with the pollution of the oceans - of ocean waters, and Iceland being an island and depending 95 percent on the fishing industry, that's the main source of income that it's dependent on - that's the largest part of the Icelandic economy - they are very concerned about the conditions of the ocean waters.

It is reported in this article that not only hundreds but hundreds of thousands of sea birds have been found dead on the shores of the British Isles and on the shores of the European countries that border on the North Sea. Ocean-going oil tankers, after they unload their cargo, fill up the tanks with sea water for ballast to keep the ships steady, but then before they load up again with another load of oil they - and it's required now that they pump this sea water out not less than 100 miles from any coastline - they pump it out and this sea water that is pumped out is filled with oil, that is the dregs of the oil that had still been left in the empty tanks, and this oil understandably floats on the surface of the water and sea birds landing in the water get their wings and feathers all stuck up with it. They can't fly and very often can't swim and they drown. Many of these manage to make land, there they die; those who can't make land, they drown out in mid-ocean where they happen to come down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt the honourable member for a moment, I think he is wandering a little far from the Minister's salary. I wonder if you will try and confine your remarks a little closer to the item that we are on.

MR. PETURSSON: I thought we were discussing health estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

MR. PETURSSON: And this is a part of health matters, I thought - even though I have travelled far from home - but I was simply indicating that it isn't just a local concern, this is a worldwide concern and unless we do something with the situation, something more than what we are doing -- I can leave off the reading of the reports of the ocean-going tankers and come back to oil refineries in our local scene which belch forth smoke and fumes and empty residue of oil, whatever you call it, processing into the rivers. They are also contaminating our rivers and our lakes locally, having exactly the same effect, probably more harmful because the volume of water is less, and in proportion the contamination is greater.

Unless something is done, more than what is being done - I appreciate the fact that the Minister did say that something was being done, but it isn't enough just to do something. We can't afford to be complacent about this. The International Joint Commission on Waterways and so on is operating, but if we are dependent on doing no more than what they have done on the American side then we are achieving very little because they are running a losing race, as it appears.

So I say simply that any action that we now take must be taken in proportion to the need and to the threat that our waters are under, and something done to keep our waters not only

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd)...as pure as they now are but continually purer so that eventually we may get them back, not completely as pure as they were 100 years ago when this country became a nation, but a fair approximation of what it was. We had pure water in this country 100 years ago; I hope that by the time that Canada celebrates its next 100th anniversary we may have clean rivers and clean lakes full of fish and fit for people to swim in.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to help my honourable friend the Minister out because I know that he wouldn't want to start his report at this late hour and I just want to ask a couple of questions that will take the remainder of the time.

I don't suppose that there is a week goes by in my constituency but that a constituent doesn't phone me to enquire as to how he or she can get themselves or a friend of theirs into the crowded hospitals in Winnipeg, and this is a bit of a problem that I experienced myself. Now, Dr. Bradley, according to a report that you have in your hand I believe my honourable friend, suggests that - and this is from the Free Press, November 15th, 1966 and I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and yourself were arguing about this yesterday - but this report says that the General Hospital employs 235 out of 1,005 beds, and the article goes on to say that "Only 235 beds out of 1,005 in Winnipeg General Hospital are available for general use." That's what the article says. It also goes on to say that the staff doctors - the staff doctors of the hospital pretty well have control of the remaining beds, that is they see to it who gets in and who shall not get in to the limited number of beds that are available to the public. Therefore, the rural doctors of the province, not being staff doctors of the Winnipeg General, are more or less left out in the cold, and this article goes on to support that. In fact my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture's brother reports here - Alderman Enns has something to say about this fact.

Now if these are facts that are reported here, it is a sad situation. It's a sad situation when people in the rural areas paying exactly the same fee for their hospitalization premiums - paying exactly the same fee - do not get the same consideration for admission to Winnipeg hospitals. This article suggests that they don't. Furthermore, these articles go on to suggest that if after pressing for admission to the hospital that it is finally granted, nine times out of ten you will be told that there are no public wards available but they could, for consideration of \$5.00 or \$10.00, let you in a semi-private or a private bed.

Now this happened with my own wife when we were in here once. They said, "Listen, there's no public ward available but for \$4.75," I think it was, "per day we'll let you into the other." Well we were so glad to get in we accepted their offer, but I'm wondering if my honourable friend the Minister would care to comment - would care to comment on the report that I have just made in the --(Interjection)-- I think they're both from the Free Press of about November 15th last. One headed: "Nurse Lack Reduces Use of Wards," and the other one is: "MD's Take Up The Cudgels in Hospital Battle Over Training Beds." Mr. Chairman, perhaps you would like to now call it 5:30 or thereabouts.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, I think that in the time we have available I might as well answer one or two of the questions that have been asked today. In the matter of the hospital district clarification, these clinics that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface referred to will be provided for where there is a hospital district, and a hospital district might have two or three hospitals in it. He also refers to the Pan Am Games. Has the hospital commission done anything with the Pan Am people to assure that there's going to be adequate hospital coverage. The hospital commission have been meeting with the Pan American Association upon that matter. He asks about the two-year courses, and if a student with a diploma wishes to go into the university she will have to put in another two years in order to get the baccalaureate degree. He also asks a question about - I haven't got the information right at hand so I can get it at a little later date.

In respect to the Dominion Foundry and the Honourable the Member for East Kildonan - and I'm sorry if I get those constituencies mixed up over there but I'm afraid - Elmwood - I'm afraid I do. Dominion Foundry, as he pointed out, have made over the period of years certain renovations and at the present time they are meeting the regulations that are laid down under The Public Health Act. The responsibility really rests with the City of Winnipeg Health Department, and I think I'm correct in that, but we do some of the technical services for the City of Winnipeg Health Department in the measuring of the particular matter that comes from the stack and the noise level that comes from the foundry itself, and the last report I had was that at the moment they are meeting the regulations that we have in the province.

(MR. WITNEY cont'd)....

The Member for Rhineland asks about the question of grants from the Federal Government. The Federal Government are still giving their \$2,000 per bed or bed equivalent and that is matched by the Provincial Government on a \$2,000 per bed or bed equivalent. Now whether it's 20 percent or 25 percent with respect to the Eden Mental Health Centre, as per the agreement - it is 25 percent - and we are putting figures in the estimates in relation to the fiscal year instead of the calendar year because the Province of Manitoba operates on the fiscal year but the hospital commission and the budgeting of the hospitals is done on the calendar year. But we have done it because of the fact that the province operates on a fiscal period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30. I leave the Chair until 8:00 tonight.