

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 1, 1969

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.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Before the Orders of the Day, I will take a moment to introduce our young guests. We have 80 students of Grade 11 standing of the John Taylor Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Schrofel, Mr. Groff and Mrs. MacDonald. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. We also have 35 students of Grade 5 standing of the Lord Selkirk School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Jessie Zulkowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. We also have 50 students of Grade 11 standing of the Stonewall Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Krawic. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Assembly I welcome you all here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the past I have directed questions as has the Member for Inkster regarding the fare increase. Has the Minister informed the press that he is going to introduce legislation which would permit the Metropolitan Corporation to grant special fares without going to the Utility Board?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I believe the question was alluded to yesterday when I answered the Honourable Member for Inkster that that was one of many amendments to The Metropolitan Corporation Act that was going to be brought in, that I was sure with the attitude of all members in this House that that would be an amendment that would be passed unanimously and that the Metropolitan Corporation Council would have the right to adjust fares for certain groups and classes as they see fit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. A fear of flood is reported from the Province of Saskatchewan in the Qu'Appelle and Souris Rivers - a serious flood - and these rivers flow into the Assiniboine River. Could the Honourable Minister report to us on the check that his department is keeping on the likelihood of flooding in the Assiniboine River.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, we're aware of the situation in those areas referred to by the Honourable Member from Burrows. We do not feel at this point that it will change appreciably the forecasts that have already been made regarding the flood situation on the Assiniboine. I would take it upon myself to keep the members informed if anything new develops in this regard.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In his capacity as acting Minister of Agriculture dealing with this question of flooding, is it a fact that the government has now made it plain that it is extending to any farmers who might wish to avail themselves of it, the same privileges that have been extended to those in the Red River Valley with regard to quotas and assistance on moving grain and assistance on storage, and also in the Whitemud area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not wishing to speak in the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, but it is my understanding that the same approach is being taken to any other areas that are faced with similar difficulties. The Member for Lakeside will appreciate that it's one thing for us to suggest and to urge the Federal Government or the agency of the Federal Government, the Wheat Board, to do something and another thing from it happening. The Wheat Board has accepted the increased quota allotment in the Red River Valley. To my knowledge they have not accepted this anywhere else in the province.

I understand that officials from the Department of Agriculture are currently taking similar inventory of grains that could be in difficulty along the Assiniboine, particularly from

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.)... Portage east to Winnipeg that have been known to be subject to flash flooding should an ice jam occur. These steps are being taken by the Department of Agriculture. I think I can answer affirmatively to those other matters in the form of whatever assistance applicable to farmers of the Red River Valley will be made to the farmers throughout the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question. Would my honourable friend not agree though that if the conditions are similar that his department or those of the Minister of Agriculture would be equipped with very strong arguments to urge on the Wheat Board for similar consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): In the absence of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, I'd like to direct my question to his acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. My question is, and you may take it as notice if you don't know anything about it: has the Manitoba Vegetable Growers' Association made any representations to the government regarding compensation for loss of potatoes or damage to potatoes due to flooding in the area in the Red River Valley or in any other portion of Manitoba?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the matter referred to by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I might make one correction in his statement with respect to when he says "damage due to flooding". Generally we talk about flooding in its disaster form. I think the damage that the potato growers of this province suffered in the last season was primarily from the inclement weather that all agriculture was faced with. I can say no more than that I'm aware that the request has been made. I believe the Minister of Agriculture is taking this under active consideration. No policy has been arrived at by this government.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question. Could you give the House any idea as to when a policy statement will be made by the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Some weeks ago, shortly after the House opened, I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he could supply the House with the figures giving the amount of fertilizer produced in Manitoba and the amount of fertilizer exported and he undertook to give that information to the House and I believe when he was here he told me he would be getting it through your department. I wonder if that information could be supplied at an early date.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Minister of Agriculture undertook to supply and I believe he will. If information has been requested from the Department I'm not aware specifically of this but I'll check into that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the announcement last night of 170 people losing their jobs yesterday in Brandon, I wondered if the Minister has any immediate plans for these people to have another job such as new industry so that they won't be forced to move from their area.

MR. SPIVAK: May I ask what you're referring to when you say 170 jobs?

MR. DAWSON: A hundred and seventy jobs, 120 people were laid off from the Manitoba Pool and 50 from the oil refinery, in both places in Brandon.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to the House that Canada Manpower was informed of the layoffs that were forecast and that our department worked with the appropriate officials to try and see that positions would be found for the individuals either in the Brandon area or at least in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation which would do away with customer signatures when purchasing liquor?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, there will be a bill coming in with respect to amendments to The Liquor Act and that item undoubtedly will be among those that will be considered or placed before the House for consideration.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the

(MR. JOHNSTON Cont'd.).... Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and the question is with respect to flood control on the Assiniboine River in the vicinity of the construction of the Portage Diversion. I have in my hand a copy of a resolution from the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie, which my friend has received, and I would just like to quote one of the "Whereases", "And whereas flooding could result from ice jams and/or provincial government action in having logs cut and left lying in the Assiniboine River Valley in the vicinity of Portage la Prairie." Could my honourable friend give an undertaking that he would have those people responsible for leaving cut brush and logs on the river bed to have this removed before the ice goes out in order to lessen the possibilities of jams?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite clear as to the responsibility of the brushing and logs that he refers to. If, as I am given to understand, that there is some private brushing or clearing of land that is taking place that may be involved here, that I'm sure the member will acknowledge is a problem but one that the private individual has to deal with. If on the other hand my own or water control crews or construction crews that have been involved with the construction of the Portage Diversion are the ones who have caused the situation then certainly I'll attend to it.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Perhaps a word of explanation. This is the brushing that has been undertaken by the contractors who are clearing the land which will be the forebay, if that's the word, behind the low level dam, and it's work being carried on by contractors who have contracted with the provincial government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Since there have been numerous complaints about the air service to Minneapolis, I wonder whether the Manitoba Government has attempted to pressure the Federal Government to allow a Canadian airlines to provide a service to the Twin Cities?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. With the higher interest rates that are now available for people wishing to save money, has there been any inordinate redemption of Manitoba bonds, and if so does the government find that it's having to pay higher interest rates for the borrowing of money?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): I think the answer to my honourable friend's question are about as follows: Has there been inordinate inroads into the holdings of bonds? They've been very severe during the last year. The amounts of Manitoba Savings Bonds still outstanding are now small and do not constitute a worry to us at the present time that they'll be further reduced. The money to replace them has in fact had to be borrowed at rates higher than those that did apply to the savings bonds themselves. The cost of interest in that connection has gone up. Does that answer the questions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. Last Thursday he indicated that he expected that in a day or two thereafter he would be able to inform us as to the plans that the department has in relation to the people who are threatened with flooding on Turnbull Drive and Red River Drive which was discussed during his estimates and of which he was aware. Does he now have the information?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I do not have the information on hand. I know that officials from my department have been in touch with this group of people. I'll undertake to have a report of that meeting for the Honourable Member for St. John's hopefully tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'd like to address this question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Have you had an opportunity since returning to your office to peruse a letter dated March 13, 1969, which you received from the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg enclosing a copy of the report of E. A. Levin, Director of Planning, dated March 12, 1969, respecting an application of Tartan Brewery for a rezoning in the Municipality of St. Andrews?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, replying for my honourable friend. As he knows from the correspondence that was tabled that this was considered by a Committee of Council. It is our understanding that Metropolitan Council has not considered the report of the committee.

MR. HILLHOUSE: My question is: has the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce had an opportunity of seeing this letter and perusing the report contained therein?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Have you or had the Government of Manitoba decided to take any action on the recommendations or requests made of you by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Does the Government of Manitoba intend to take any action in respect of these recommendations?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that's a question of policy.

MR. HILLHOUSE: How soon will we know the government's policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk I believe has exhausted his privilege. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Transportation. Could he advise the House when we might expect the Report of the Committee on Northern Transportation?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't received it yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the Minister in a position to confirm that Northwest Industries Limited will be taking over the Air Canada Overhaul Base?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance relative to the one that I asked previously. Is the government giving consideration to the creation of another bond issue bearing a higher interest rate for the purpose of financing its activities?

MR. EVANS: Creating another bond issue. Does my honourable friend mean a savings bond issue?

MR. GREEN: A Manitoba bond issue similar to the one that was launched...

MR. EVANS: Known to me under the title of saving bonds?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. EVANS: With a guaranteed repayment? No, no present consideration is being given to an issue of that kind. However, I would not wish to close off this option for the future. I have no present indication that we will have one but I don't say that we will never have one.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Minister has no knowledge of a news report today that a meeting is being held in Winnipeg Thursday to announce that the Northwest Industries are taking over the base?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that was not the question that was asked of me.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, I'll ask that question, then. Has the Minister any knowledge of the meeting that's being held to announce the takeover.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that Northwest Industries, along with another firm, have in fact negotiated with the Federal Government in connection with the Air Canada Overhaul Base. I am not aware of any finalization of the overhaul base takeover at the present time. I'm also aware that officials from Air Canada and from the Federal government will probably be in town on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It has been announced that Northern Natural Gas Company of Omaha will be building a 36 inch pipeline for the export of natural gas to Minnesota and this is to pass through Manitoba soil. Will the people of Manitoba be represented at this hearing

(MR. HANUSCHAK Cont'd.),... with a view to protecting our interests as the export of gas might affect our future industrial development?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to my dear friend, the Minister of Health. A news report on Saturday indicated that the Minister had made announcement of a policy to assure the rural areas - I was going to say an adequate supply of dentists, I'm putting it in another way - a supply of dentists, and it outlined the policy briefly as being...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I could have the privilege of hearing the honourable gentleman's question rather than a speech.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The question is: Was that policy announced in the House, and if it was, what day and hour was it made in the House?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): It was in the House, it was made last week, Mr. Speaker. I would have to ask my honourable friend, just check Hansard. I'll...

MR. SHOEMAKER: What time?

MR. JOHNSON: It was made at 2:30 p.m. one afternoon, in the latter part of last week, for my dear honourable friend...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question either to the Minister of Government Services or Municipal Affairs, I'm not sure. Will the House be getting reports from the Management and the Planning Priority Committee?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Premier is the Minister who should deal with this question. Certainly matters to do with Management Committee, I'm quite prepared to discuss on my estimates, I am the chairman of the Management Committee, but perhaps the question should be directed to the Premier when he is in his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the one directed by the Member for Burrows. With respect to this pipeline that's being proposed by Northern Natural Gas, which they plan to build from Pointed Mountain to North Branch, Minnesota, and the route of this pipeline would take it across the southwestern part of Manitoba. I'll direct the question to the House Leader because I'm not sure who else should answer it. Would approval have to be obtained from the Provincial Government to build such pipeline through Manitoba?

MR. LYON: We'd have to review the legislation, Mr. Speaker, in that regard. There are a number of provincial Acts and then of course it is an interprovincial construction that my honourable friend is talking about. We would have to look at all of the matters that I have referred to before anybody could attempt even to give him an opinion on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can he inform the House now as to when we might get the report of the TED Commission?

MR. SPIVAK: Very soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Is it printed yet?

MR. SPIVAK: I am informed that it has been printed, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we found on our desks a seating plan of the Legislative Assembly, together with other information. Could we be informed why the Leader of the New Democratic Party is not listed amongst the various individuals whose name appear. I believe that he is recognized by this Assembly and yet his name does not appear. Is there a reason for this? Is there some rule of protocol limiting the...

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take the matter under advisement. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister tell me if the City of Brandon or the Town of Flin Flon can regulate their own bus fares for their transit system?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand they would have to make application to the

(MR. BAIZLEY Cont'd.)... Utility Board for regulation of their fare.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. Why are we not treating all Manitobans the same? If Winnipeg has to have an elderly citizens fare, why has Brandon and Flin Flon not been included?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood,

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct another question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce about an airline link-up with Minneapolis. Could the Minister inform the House as to who gives the final approval on such an airline arrangement and also when that decision may be forthcoming?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, those are subject of bilateral agreements between the United States and the Federal Government. Of course it is handled by the federal officials. Our representations have been made to the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Paul Hellyer, and to the Minister without Portfolio, the Honourable James Richardson.

MR. DOERN: Could I ask the Minister to answer the part as to when a decision might be forthcoming or when negotiations may take place on that?

MR. SPIVAK: The various bilateral agreements are being negotiated this year and we would hope that there would be consideration given to additional link-ups between Winnipeg and Minneapolis, and as a matter of fact, between Winnipeg and many other major centres in the midwestern area of the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Finance. Shortly after the House began sitting he indicated to the House that he intended to bring his budget down about the end of March. Is he in a position to tell us now when he plans to bring it down?

MR. EVANS: Not the precise day, Mr. Speaker, but my impression is it will not be this week. I'm not in a position to announce the precise day. It will be I hope, within a week or 10 days.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Yesterday I asked him some questions about John Fisher. Could he give us the answer at this time?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can inform my honourable friend that John Fisher is a consultant, we know that, but I can't answer the other part of his question as to whether he was hired or not. This is what I'm trying to determine.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, has he been hired as a consultant by the Manitoba Centennial Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: I thought I heard the Honourable Minister say that he was trying to determine whether he'd been hired and I wondered if that didn't answer that part of the question that the honourable gentleman rose to ask.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that he's a consultant but he doesn't know whether he's paid or not? Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce re the TED Report, having established that it's now printed. Has the Minister seen the TED Report yet or has anyone in the government?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and there'll be a statement made shortly in connection with it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister mean to say he has to take the question as notice as to whether he has seen the report?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to answer for any other member of the government.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I wonder if he might answer for himself or whether he needs notice to find out whether or not he has seen the report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that TED is quite a boy. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS: I wonder if I may ask the Clerk of the House to distribute to the members just a brief pamphlet dealing with oil exploration and production in the Province of Manitoba, just as matter of general information to the House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, when we dealt with the estimates of the Department of Natural Resources and Drainage, the Honourable Minister stated that he would provide us with plans as far as drainage program for this year. Are those plans available by now?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was agreement last evening that we would now move to the Committee of the Whole House on Page No. 3, to deal with Bill No. 33.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . just clarify the agreement that when we come out of committee we'll deal with third reading and after that we go to Private Members. Is that correct?

-- (Interjection) -- No, No.

MR. LYON: I understood that we would be devoting the afternoon to government matters and the evening would be Private Members.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, no, my understanding was that we would deal with this Bill right through to the end of it, and then we go to Private Members, because Private Members normally is a longer session than the evening session. -- (Interjection) -- We have 2 1/2 hours to go. I'm not quibbling about that but I did understand that we are setting aside Private Members for this purpose.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think that as far as I was concerned, that the arrangement was not spelled out in exact terms in that way, but certainly it is my understanding that we were giving over the full afternoon to the government in exchange for the government giving us the evening sitting. We realize that that was a little longer time that we were giving away but in the interests of consideration of this Bill, that it was the right thing to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Could I have a motion from the floor?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Transportation, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 33, An Act to Amend the Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will start at Section 11 (a). (Sections 11 to 17 were read section by section and passed.) Section 18, (27 (6)) passed; (27 (7))--passed..

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, does the Minister wish to say anything about 27 (7)? As far as records are concerned, will there be no time limit set on that? Pertaining to the corporation keeping the records of an employer?

MR. JOHNSON: How long they have to keep these records?

MR. BARKMAN: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: You've got me there. I'd have to inquire. This is simply making it compatible with the Hospital Insurance Scheme, as you know the right to inspect records which an employer shall produce on demand. I don't know of the time limitation on that but I can get that information, if anyone's in earshot. -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Isn't that covered in the general law regarding the destruction of public documents?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, I'd have to....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: This also speaks of retaining these records until they have been inspected and this could be a year, for that matter. There's no time limit as to when this inspection is supposed to be concluded, therefore I feel there should be a time limit on it somewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Minister going to reply or....?

MR. JOHNSON: It has been the practice for 11 years, but I'm not sure if it's covered as the Honourable Member for Selkirk says, under the general law of the land, but I would hope to clarify this within a few minutes -- if we were to go on and send a note in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we pass that and get the answer after from the Minister? Section 27 (7) passed; Section 18--passed. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I'm dealing with 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Section 19.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this is the issue that was raised yesterday before Law Amendments Committee. I just want to go over it slowly to make sure every member in the House understands what the present import of the Act is and what it is proposed to do by the amendment which I will be putting forward. According to the present Act, Mr. Chairman, as I read it, if employees have negotiated a collective agreement whereby their employer pays either all or part of the existing medical plan, the Act requires that that agreement will be amended. Mr. Chairman, I want to make that plain, that the present Act recognizes the need of amending the collective agreement without the consent of the parties. And it requires that the present collective agreement be amended so that the employer will pay the same thing to the Manitoba Medical Plan, that is the public health plan, that he was paying under the old plan. But, Mr. Chairman, although those are the words, and although the intention to me of the government was to not prejudice the employee, the way the Act is now written, what would occur in practise is this, and I would ask members to note. If the employer was presently paying the entire medical care costs for his employees, he would be paying roughly \$200.00 to the Manitoba Medical Services. Under the new scheme, if he paid the whole amount, he would be paying the Manitoba Medical Plan, our new plan, \$120.00, which would be an outright saving, Mr. Chairman, to the employer of \$80.00. And I fully believe, Mr. Chairman, that what is intended is that that employee would get the savings and really it's not a savings at all, because in most cases the employee will be paying the social development tax, which is the same thing as everybody in this House will have to pay, but he will not be able to have the reduction which all of us are entitled to, by virtue of the new scheme. Each member knows that if his premiums go down, the \$80.00 savings on medical premium will be available to him for payment of the other tax or will be available as a saving.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I dealt with the situation whereby the employer pays for the whole plan. Let's take another instance, and I want to make this clear, if the employer pays for half the plan under the old system he will be paying \$100.00; under the new system he will be paying \$60.00. And I submit to you that the savings of \$40.00 should be to the employee and not the employer, because, Mr. Chairman, the employees have by collective bargaining established their entitlement to this money, and if those people who know anything about collective bargaining, know that it's treated in exactly this way. It's treated as part of the wage package and this legislation will reduce the wage package by the amount that the payment made by the employer is reduced. Mr. Chairman, I fully believe that the government intends that the savings that would be accomplished by this plan would go to the people for whose benefit the plan was enacted. That where your premiums go down, Mr. Chairman, you will retain the saving, or anybody else's goes down they will retain the saving, and I don't think that the government intends to penalize people who have entered into a collective agreement and thereby got their medical plan paid for that way. Because let's take two employees, Mr. Chairman. One group of employees negotiates for the employer to pay the entire medical costs. The other group negotiates for the cash value of those medical costs - and as far as the employer is concerned, he doesn't care, he will give you either. The group of employees that negotiated for full payment of medical costs will lose \$80.00; the group that negotiated for the cash, will retain \$80.00. This will affect nobody else, Mr. Chairman. What I am proposing will not cost the government one cent. It will not cost the employers one cent. It will merely mean that people who have entered into collective agreements obtaining payment of their medical costs will get the same savings as every other citizen in the province of Manitoba. And I'd like to refer, Mr. Chairman, because I think it's important to the present legislation which anticipates this type of problem for the employers benefit -- and I'm not blaming the members of the government. I don't think that they purposely tried to favour the employer as against the employee, this is, in my opinion, accidental and I certainly hope it's accidental -- but they say that the amount that the employer will pay will not be in excess of the amount - "The amount that the employer is required to pay will not be in excess of the amount that he is now paying."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if they would only have included the same provision the other way, that it will not be in excess of, and it will not be less than, the amount that he is

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.).... presently paying, then I submit that we would be holding the status quo which is what I hope, I hope against hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is what the government intends to do. Because if it doesn't do this, Mr. Chairman, it will be taking, as indicated by the Member for Churchill, it will be taking \$240,000 out of the pockets of the employees of the International Nickel Company and putting it into the pockets of the company. And I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that that's what's intended. I don't think that it's intended to give to companies in Manitoba a direct subsidy if they have previously been paying part of the employees medical plan. It interferes, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think the government wants to do this, with the competitive position as between two different companies. Both have negotiated wage agreements, with one stroke of the pen the government is going to put one of those companies in an extremely advantageous position by giving them a direct subsidy of money. Now, Mr. Chairman, what we propose is very simple. We say that the dollar value of the contribution of the employer shall stay the same, that he will make that dollar value contribution, in other words let's take the two previous cases. If he's paying the whole share and he is making a savings of \$80.00 he will distribute that amount to the employees in wages. If he is paying half the share and his contribution would - as by the government plan - go from \$100.00 to \$60.00 he will continue to pay \$100.00. The employee will not get anything, but the employees share of the medical contributions will be reduced from \$100.00 to \$40.00, and the employers share would go up, but neither of them would lose any money. This provision, Mr. Chairman, and I'm taking great pains to explain it because I feel that the government is about to embark on a very mistaken course. I'm really trying to prevent what I think would be a disaster, that if they do what they say they are doing, they are going to be, Mr. Chairman, taking money out of the pockets of the employees. Nobody else will suffer disadvantage; none of the members of this Chamber will suffer disadvantage. And those employees, Mr. Chairman, are paying the two percent development tax, which is in part responsible for the reduction of the premium, and they're not getting the reimbursement which everybody else is.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Bill be amended by the addition of a new Section 19 as follows: Section 19 is amended by repealing subsection (d) - and Mr. Chairman, when this was originally presented we also repealed (e) and (f) in Law Amendments but I see that it can't work without (e) and (f) and then that's a mistake. So, we're just repealing subsection (d) of subsection 1 of Section 28, and you have to go to the Act to find that, and substituting therefor the following: The payment to the corporation by the employer for or on behalf of the employee of the same amount of money which immediately prior to the date on which this section takes effect he was required to pay under the terms of the agreement, provided if this said amount is in excess of the premium payable by the employee herein, such excess shall be paid to the employee as part of his wages until the said agreement is terminated by the parties or by operation of law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one point that has been raised by members for the other side, and I believe it's a misconception. They say that they don't want to interfere with the sanctity of the collective agreements, and, Mr. Chairman, I believe that I revere just as much collective agreements as members opposite, perhaps maybe even a little bit more, but nevertheless they're saying they don't want to interfere with the sanctity of the collective agreement. But, Mr. Chairman, the clause directly says that they are amending the collective agreement, it says that "the collective agreement shall be deemed to be amended." Mr. Chairman, the clause is worse than if there were no clause at all. If there were no clause at all, in other words if the employer was left with a collective agreement which required him to pay to MMS, I'm satisfied in a court of law that if the plan terminated the employee could probably recover an unjust enrichment from the employer; that if there was a collective agreement and we didn't have this section, I'm certain, Mr. Chairman, that the court would say that that money does not belong to the employer. So, if anybody is interfering with a collective agreement it's this government. I'm quite certain, Mr. Chairman, if the MMS plan went out of existence, if the government didn't legislate, if the company had previously been paying \$200.00 a year to MMS, that no court would say that the bringing in of the Statute wipes out that money unless it said so. That money would be put into a fund to protect exactly what it was protecting before - the dollar amount. But this legislation, Mr. Chairman, prevents the natural course of law from taking its effect, and we are saying to this government, please, Mr. Minister - I haven't used that term to this government before -

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.).... but please don't adopt this course, put into the Act what I'm sure you must have as reasonable men have intended to do, and let the employees who you intend to benefit by this medical plan, receive the benefit which everybody else will be getting by virtue of this legislation. There are certain problems with the legislation but certainly if there's a reduced premium, which requires by the way that they pay a two percent development tax, that everybody else will be getting this reduced premium, and I'm sure the First Minister wants these employees to get it just the same as everybody else.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the honourable member that's just spoken a question? Has my honourable friend checked the amendment that he is moving with the Legislative Counsel?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, all our amendments were just put in, we didn't check it with the Legislative Counsel, but I'd be happy if Legislative Counsel will use words which will be appropriate to doing what I am suggesting, because we have used words which we think does the job, but if the Minister wants to do what I've said in my remarks, well we're not wedded to the words of the amendment. We'd be quite happy if Legislative Counsel put it in those terms.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my reason for asking is that I have seen through the years the difficulties that have sometimes happened because of changing legislation, just while we're going through it in either Committee or Committee of the Whole. It seems to me that my honourable friend from Inkster makes a good argument. I'm not anything like as conversant with the subject as he, but the burden of his argument seemed to be that there would be a disadvantage to people who had been receiving that advantage before, under a collective agreement. Some would not be disadvantaged and others would. Well, I'm sure that the government did not intend that. So, I suggest, and this is free legal advice, couldn't we simply put in a less cumbersome amendment than the one that my honourable friend suggests, and simply say that nothing in this section shall disadvantage either side in an existing collective agreement?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I might say, because my honourable friend wasn't here yesterday, we moved this amendment at Law Amendments and the Minister said that he would look at it and if he has something to put in which will be simpler, I'm very happy -- the simpler the amendment the better, and will relieve the necessity of the legal counsel of both my honourable friend and myself.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the combined wisdom of the government is coming forward here. I would suggest an amendment to this section, and I think we could distribute if we have any copies of something that...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...decide now where we go.

MR. JOHNSON: Could I make a statement first. I think in fairness the Member from Inkster might like to look at this and the Leader of the Opposition, the proposal we have here. We feel that sections (e) and (f) should be left in for the proper conduct of the plan, but that we're suggesting that possibly an amendment to clause (d) clarifying the section, because this was drawn as I understand it with the full intent that the employee and employer as much as possible would clarify this between themselves, but as some may be up for negotiation now, some later, maybe we should clarify the clause (d). So, I would, subject to reviewing the honourable members proposed amendment and having had the wisdom of my colleague the Minister of Labour and Legislative Counsel, propose the following amendment: "that Bill 33 be amended by renumbering sections 19 to 27 as numbers 20 to 28 and adding thereto after Section 18 the following section: clause (d) of section 1 of section 26 repealed and substitute clause (19), and clause (d) of subsection 1 of 28 of the Act is being repealed and the following clause substituted: (d) The payment to the corporation by the employer for or on behalf of the employee of the same amount of monies which immediately prior to the date on which this section takes effect, he was required to pay under the terms of the agreement, but if the amount required to be paid by the employer to the corporation as premium under this Act is less than the amount the employer was required to pay under the agreement, the employer shall until the agreement is terminated (1) pay the excess to or for the benefit of the employee; or subsection (2), give the employees other benefits of equivalent value to the value of the excess by way of additional holidays with pay, additional vacation with pay, time off with pay, welfare benefits or other variation in working conditions."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, now the Minister certainly has confirmed that his intent is to do good. I'm satisfied with that. But this other - this subsection 2, subsection 2 is a

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.).... real problem in my opinion. Up to subsection 1 everything is fine, "pay the excess to or for the benefit of the employee," that's fine. "Give the employees other benefits of equivalent value to the value of the excess by way of additional holidays with pay etc., etc." Mr. Chairman, this is what unions and management spent months negotiating upon. You're going to have negotiations and all these contracts entered into between the employers and the employees to fight about whether this is equivalent in dollar value. I at least feel that this amendment removes the direct loss provision which is available in the other, but I believe that the Minister is embarking on a very weird and wondrous task if he wants to open up negotiations as to what is the dollar equivalent. The dollar equivalent is simplest put in dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the way I see the present amendment before us would mean that where you have agreements in effect and where as a result of the new premiums being lower than the original ones that the employer would effect certain savings. But this would then not require a cash outlay if he followed the (ii) section of this particular amendment, and therefore probably is a good one. I would not say that it would apply in all cases but there is a choice in my opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think we've got to discuss this quite seriously and explore it because I think now there is no quarrel on the principle. I think that the government has seen the point and agrees with the point and now the question is to make this work.

The point made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland is one I don't understand at all because up to now the employer has been paying cash to the MMS or any other scheme and now the Member for Rhineland says, well good, now he doesn't have to pay cash and convert it into something else. And the confusion that I have trying to understand him is created in part by this (ii), this alternative which is going to create confusion and certainly that's not your intention. Because firstly you're saying "the employer shall either pay the excess to or for the benefit of employees" -- well that's simple enough, that's a calculable amount, we're talking about dollars and they pay it -- "or the employer shall give the employees other benefits." Now you're in trouble. How do you value it? Who values it? Is it the employer who has the unilateral right to assess the value of these other benefits? Does the employee then acquire a right to grieve that he's not getting the correct amount in benefits; and do we then have a reference in so many cases to arbitration under an agreement, but all we're talking about is recognition of a few dollars a month, and that's the most it can be although it's important, in terms of benefit rather than in dollars. Now I don't know how you give a man additional vacation time with pay when your vacation is related to a percentage of pay, and if you have a percentage of pay then is this extra dollar itself going to confuse the calculation of vacation time because then he might be entitled to vacation pay on the additional dollar or two that he's getting by way of "additional vacation". And I'm putting it in that way because -- and I know that the way I've put it is confusing -- and I've done it not intentionally but I've done it in a manner that's confusing because I can see that the problem would be confusing. And I can see arguments and arbitration boards just on the question of how do you calculate additional vacation time with pay. I would buy this proposal because of the principle it sets out, but to the extent that I have some experience in both negotiations and arbitration I'm afraid that we may be involving the parties in problems of interpretation under the second alternative. Maybe I should say that as a lawyer involved in a certain amount of negotiation and arbitration work I would benefit from it, maybe I would because I might become employed in trying to discuss the benefits, but that's not the government's intention nor really is it mine. I would suggest that you study carefully whether it's an easy thing to translate this benefit which we all agree on into these other suggested says, "welfare benefits or other variation." I think you've got troubles which you wouldn't have if you just deleted the second portion and left it at "or" and then it's a calculable item.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): We would have troubles I think either way that we dealt with this matter because in the interim of this Act being considered and the amendments being considered there have been negotiations underway between employers and employees, in some cases they have been on a mutual basis, and the agreements that have been reached between them have not simply been an agreement dealing in amount of monies. There have been some situations where the equivalent has been negotiated with a union and

(MR. WITNEY Cont'd.)... vice versa in forms of welfare benefits of one type or another and that is the reason why we have put in this flexibility in here in order to accommodate what has already taken place. I might say just in case that any of the employers wonder about this, that it was the original intent of the Act not to change in any way whatever an agreement that had been negotiated between the employee and the employer, and in this case, and I've heard quite a bit about the premiums, because the premium is lower in some cases that was going to alter in some way or another the agreement, which was never the intent of the original clause. Yesterday I perhaps could have solved some of this problem when it arose in Law Amendments because I was concerned about the Legislature entering overtly into a collective agreement that had been negotiated between the employee and the employer and I was not sure as to what the actual words were in the Bill 68, that on return and on reflection and being the man that at the time took the bill through, we have tried to in this amendment here to accommodate the original intent which was quite clear at that time and because of negotiations that have taken place we have felt that this flexibility is needed and this is the reason for the amendment.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Minister certainly has made a deliberate and honest attempt to rectify what the problem is. I make my point that I feel that subsection 2 will create difficulties. In his wisdom, if he wants to insist upon it, I can see a little bit of legal work for myself involved - and maybe I'm speaking out of self-interest now - if he leaves it that way. I'd sooner have it thrown out and forget the self-interest. The same way with sub-paragraph 1: "Pay the excess to or for the benefit of the employee." The words "or for the benefit" will create a problem. I'm satisfied that the Minister at least has cleared up the difficulty in the intent which I always thought was there on the part of the government. If it's your intention that it continue this way I register a protest. I don't jump up and down or stamp my feet. I think that it's an improvement but it certainly is going to create some problems.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I just comment briefly once more. I think it will create problems but so would the original section of the Act as events have turned out with respect to the premium. I'm pointing out to you that the reason we have taken this is to allow for the flexibility and in consideration of arrangements which have been made already between employers and employees.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I buy that. I buy that completely especially since I've spent the last few days drawing a supplementary agreement to a working agreement taking care of just the point that has been mentioned, that was by negotiation and the parties agreed to it. So I comprehend exactly what you're saying, and what I really understand you now to be saying in this proposal is that either they will negotiate a change in benefit which will result in the same dollar value or they will pay the money. Now is that it? Either they will agree on a change or they'll pay the money to the employee. And if I'm right then possibly it would be just as well to say in (2) "by agreement between the parties give the employee", so that if they agree on a different benefit then by all means, but in they don't then it will be the alternative (1) which is pay the excess. Would that not sort of prevent any future debate between the parties if you'd just say No. 2 "By agreement between the parties give the employee." And I'm not pushing this at all because we're all interested in the same thing and if the Minister feels that he's afraid he's going to find other troubles all right, but it may be that this will help him get this clearer. I'm just throwing it out as a suggestion not an amendment.

MR. WITNEY: Excuse me. I wonder if I could have the benefit of advice from Mr. Tallin, please.

Mr. Chairman I appreciate the fact that there is helpful advice being given, but on the basis of what I was trying to recommend to the Minister and what I had advice from the Counsel and from my own staff, I think I'll stay with the amendment as it is, at least in recommending to the Minister that he carry forward with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to deal with the amendment of the Honourable Member for Inkster? His amendment to Bill No. 33, Section 19.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I willingly withdraw my amendment in favour of the amendment that's put by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. GREEN: I would like to just be a joint party to that amendment if I can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well it's agreed then by everyone that the Honourable Member for Inkster withdraws his amendment. Now we'll deal with the amendment of the Honourable

(MR. CHAIRMAN Cont'd.)... Minister of Health.

MR. CAMPBELL: Has the Honourable Minister moved it, Mr. Chairman? If not, please do so.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would therefore move that Bill 33 be amended by re-numbering Sections 19 to 27 as numbers 20 to 28 and by adding thereto after Section 18 thereof the following section: 19. Clause (d) of subsection (1) of Section 28 of the Act is repealed and the following clause is substituted therefor: (d) The payment to the corporation by the employer for, or on behalf of the employee of the same amount of monies which immediately prior to the date on which this section takes effect he was required to pay under the terms of the agreement, but if the amount required to be paid by the employer to the corporation as premium under this Act is less than the amount the employer was required to pay under the agreement the employer shall until the agreement is terminated, subsection (1) pay the excess to or for the benefit of the employees, or subsection (2) give the employees other benefits of equivalent value to the value of the excess by way of additional holidays with pay, additional vacation time with pay, time off with pay, welfare benefits or other variation in working conditions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the amendment of the Honourable Minister of Health. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now this renumbering. I wonder if I could get a little legal advice here, where we go. I'll call them by the number as restated here. So Section 19--passed; (Sections 19 to 25 were read and passed.)

Section 26. 49 (1). The Honourable Member from St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, many of us were impressed by the presentation that was made in Law Amendments Committee by both the physiotherapists and the occupational therapists. Those of us who know something of the work they do recognize that they are a very important adjunct to the medical practitioner in the work he does, and of course that is recognized in the hospitals and by the medical practitioners. It seems to me that since they being auxiliaries take over so much of the work which doctors have been doing in the past, and because as was indicated much of the work that is done, or some of the work that is done in any event, has been done in hospital and has been paid for through the Hospital Services Commission, that it would be beneficial if they are recognized so that their work will be able to be done out of hospital in the homes, in the offices, and still assist considerably the work of the medical practitioner. Now it is their work that is much more closely allied to his work and is truly a medical aspect of the work which encourages us to make a formal amendment to include the services they offer in those permissible ones in this bill, because of course it is still - under the phrasing of proposed Section 49 (1) it is still a matter for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to decide as to the extent and as to the timing or indeed whether or not to include additional services.

So that, Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 26 is amended by adding after the word "both" in the second line of proposed Section 49 (1) the following: "or physiotherapists or occupational therapists on referral from a medical practitioner." The point that I'm making there, Mr. Chairman, is that it's only that which is referred by the medical practitioner which would be acceptable, not any person who goes directly to a therapist for service, but only if it's referred by a medical practitioner as defined under the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of this amendment. The physiotherapists have been recognized I think by the medical profession for some time. Apparently there is a Federal Hospital Services and Diagnostic Services Act which has allowed for cost sharing and that this has been used by the provincial government in five Manitoba hospitals on an extended care basis. Since 1962 the Hospital Services Plan has recognized them in these five hospitals, three of them are in the Metro area: the Manitoba Rehab, the Princess Elizabeth, Children's Hospital, in Brandon the Assiniboine Hospital and at Dauphin the General Hospital. These are all extended treatment hospitals and possibly part of the problem or part of the reasoning for just extending it to these five hospitals was the shortage of staff at that time. But apparently there is a better situation at the moment; there are more physiotherapists. There are now something like 119 in practice in the province; they are recognized by the University of Manitoba and by the medical school and they work through

(MR. DOERN Cont'd.).... referral of doctors. Some of their work includes treatment for people with arthritis in terms of exercise, pool treatment and so on; post natal care and exercises; they work with orthopedic patients; they work on post-operative complications; they do some massage, and so on. Eighty percent of their work is done in hospitals. And similarly the Occupational Therapists also work with homemakers, helping them use more efficient techniques and doing carpentry and weaving and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the main reasons for including physiotherapists in particular, in this Bill, is that if a person requires treatment from a physiotherapist he has to go to one of these medical centres. This involves a certain expenditure in terms of transportation. I suppose many patients have to take taxis or make special arrangements and so on which undoubtedly increases the cost to the patient, and also some people undoubtedly stay longer in hospitals because when they require such treatment and they can only get it in the hospital, this will of course encourage them and encourage their doctor to keep them in the hospitals and I think this all adds to the cost of medical plans and it also adds to the problems of a bed shortage which is evident throughout the province. So I think there's no doubt that these people have a very high priority, that they're recognized by the profession and that they should unquestionably be included in the plan.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, probably I will be accused of not being consistent. I fought quite strongly against letting the Lieutenant-Governor -in-Council or I might say the government, the Cabinet, decide if they should extend the privilege of assignments, and now today, in this amendment, speaking on this amendment, I aim to do the very opposite. Of course, I feel that this is not so much a question of principle; it's a question of - I think that the government are the ones that will have all the facts as far as knowing how much this plan is going to cost, and I think that they will have the benefit of discussing this with the people administering the hospitals and also with the people in the medical profession.

Now, I'm not suggesting that we should include all these services now. I believe that there is another amendment coming up dealing with chiropractors and I will speak on this at the time. I am not going to vote for this amendment unless I'm sure that the government will have the opportunity or the chance to bring in any other services that might be required or drugs or anything like this, any other services. The original amendment, No. 26, I think is poorly worded. I don't know why they named the chiropractors and the optometrists. I don't know why they did that at all. I think that they should have included all this, let the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council decide of any new services. It might be that the physiotherapists have one of their members as a member of the Cabinet, I don't know, but I feel that this was wrong and I would like if the government or the party to my left will bring in an amendment that will include all these things, the possibility of all these things. In other words, that the government can say, well, that's not in the Act. Right now - maybe I misunderstand this amendment - but right now the amendment would give the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the right to include the services of chiropractors, optometrists, and physiotherapists, and to me that's not enough. I would like an amendment and I would like to see the Minister make an amendment, or the party to my left to change their amendment, where it would be up to the government to decide which services they want.

Now having said this, I might say that I also favour -- (Interjection) -- well, all right, why three? Why three? This is what I want. I want everything to be open. Why not. If you're going to amend this, let's do a good job of it. It might be that we want drugs under certain conditions; it might be that they want something else. This is all I'm saying. I'm not suggesting that now I want everybody in, but let's amend this in the right way. Let's leave the initiative, the responsibility of doing this to the government. Now having said this, I want to also add that I too have - I don't know if I should say a "weakness" or an inclination to agree with the physiotherapists for more than one reason and I think those reasons have been mentioned before. The main reason is that in certain hospitals their services are already covered, and I think the Member from Elmwood mentioned this, this might tend the people or the doctors who have patients to say, "Well, stay in the hospital because you're going to have the services covered, the services of the physiotherapist. Now if you walk out, it's not covered anymore."

I've been one that's been advocating that we do more in the field of home care and I think that this is one of the possibilities and I think the government should study this. It was

(MR. DESJARDINS Cont'd.)... an excellent brief and a good representation that we've had from Mrs. Claydon, who is not related to the member on the government side. I think it was a good representation. I think the government should really study this because it's -- we seem to agree that we want the services, especially when it comes only when prescribed by a medical man, and I think that the government should study to see if we are actually saving any money by not covering them now when they are covered in the hospital, and are we being fair to the people in rural points because the people in the city can go in hospitals but it is difficult in the rural points where they might have or they would have physiotherapists working with the doctors. So I think that if we amended this in the proper way, we'd leave it open, the government could do this study, because everything that the Minister said is not completely wrong. He said that this plan will be quite difficult to administer and I agree with him, and I think we should give him a chance to change this and modify this. This is one of the times that we can.

Now for the time being I think that we should leave this open. I don't like the idea that -- maybe I'll say a little more when this other motion comes up -- I don't like the idea that the chiropractors should come, I think it's next month or so -- for many reasons. One of the reasons is that the premiums are already too high. It is a compulsory plan, and there's a large portion of the people who do not agree that we need the services of the chiropractor. I would not hesitate to go to a chiropractor under certain conditions. I've gone and I intend to go again if I need their services. I think it is right that maybe we should not confuse the public by lumping them together with the medical profession, but mostly these services could be covered now under this Mediplus form of insurance, this private carrier, and I don't think there is any necessity at all. It is mostly lumping this group with the doctors and the doctors don't like it. This is their business. This could be covered. It is a compulsory plan and usually when you have a compulsory plan you don't start with the whole -- you don't cover the waterfront. You cover the minimum services, or what you absolutely need to start with, and then you go from there. I think -- and I guess I should wait until when this motion is introduced, but I will speak some more on this motion. Let's amend it. I think that maybe my friends from the New Democratic Party would agree with me, that they could -- I don't think they'd mind changing their amendment where they would leave all these services open instead of naming the chiropractors, optometrists and physiotherapists. If they want this, I'll support that, or if the government wants to change the amendment, I'll support that. If it's left like this I will not support it. It's not that I'm against the physiotherapists and I don't think that at this time that starting on next month or so we should have the physiotherapists, we should have all these people. As far as the physiotherapists are concerned, I think the government, if we pass a motion as I explained, I think the government will have a chance to study and to say, "Well, yes, we're going to save money and we're going to do an awful lot for the people of Manitoba; we'll go ahead. We'll be very pleased to accept this."

So I hope that my intentions are clear. I hope that you understand what I mean, that the amendment does not go far enough and we'll have to come back and amend it again maybe and add drugs, and the next year we'll maybe want chiropodists or any other group, and I think we should do it right now.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would like to add my support to this amendment. I believe that the profession of physiotherapy is an auxiliary service to the proper practice of medicine. I believe that most of our hospitals of Manitoba today do furnish that service to patients within the hospital. I know they do at the Winnipeg General and I believe they do at other hospitals, but I think that that service is also needed in respect of home care and outpatient treatment. By providing that service on a home care basis, we have a tendency today to rush our patients out of the hospital, sometimes I think a little too quickly, and sometimes those patients have to come back to the Rehab Hospital or to the physiotherapy department of the Winnipeg General Hospital for treatment, and I think if physiotherapists were included, not only for institutions but also for outpatient departments of these institutions as well as home care, it would be a tremendous boon to patient recovery in Manitoba. I would like to see this section amended so as to give the greatest possible flexibility to the proper working of this Act, and I think as a step towards that flexibility we should include physiotherapists, because they do render a service under directions of doctors and they're auxiliary to the proper practice of medicine and the after-operation care in respect of surgery. I would strongly urge the government to include them in this section.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to say immediately that I don't want to start an

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.)... argument here but with the greatest of respect I don't understand the logic of my honourable friend for St. Boniface. -- (Interjection) -- I started off when you weren't listening by saying I don't want to start an argument. You heard that part okay. All that we are doing here -- it's true what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says, that the Act could provide for a lot more. Perhaps sometimes we are trying to avoid the shafts of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and if we included a whole bunch of things, he would say, "Well you're trying to give everything", and perhaps we were too modest in this proposal. But certainly the proposal should find favour with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and if it does there's nothing to prevent him from getting up and making another amendment and moving all of the things that he wanted to put into it, and I rather think that he'll find favour with this group. So it's not logical to suggest that he won't vote for this because we haven't gone far enough. Vote for this and then go as far as you want and maybe you'll carry us along with you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, probably if I had known that this motion was coming, I would have made this amendment. And maybe I can vote for it with another vote of explanation there. I am at a loss -- why I feel that it is not right to vote for this is because I am against chiropractors being named there. This is it. Well, there's another motion. I don't mind chiropractors being included if everybody else is. We're not suggesting that they will be included at a further date. What I was suggesting is that the government would decide if there's anything else. But now I don't like to see the word -- I'm not against chiropractors as I said, but I don't like to see the chiropractors included in there when a lot of other things -- I would go ahead for drugs before chiropractors were in there, and this is why I am at a loss, when it's so difficult for me to explain what I want. -- (Interjection) -- All right. I could vote for this if you bring another amendment but I still prefer -- I want this to be open. You said yesterday that you didn't think I wanted the plan to work, but I do want the plan to work and I think that this is one of the cases that we could very well leave with the government and let them decide. Now if we start spelling one or two -- who? The people that speak the loudest or are the closest to the government might have their profession in there and not the others. -- (Interjection) -- No, you're too far -- the lawyers will never be in there.

So if there definitely will be an amendment on chiropractors, I can go ahead and support this, although I still don't like it, because then we're starting dealing with every single -- we can deal with every single one. They all came here and I don't want to fight between these groups. Like I don't want to see the chiropractors in there. It's not that I have anything against them, but I said this is a compulsory plan, this could be covered with the -- what is it -- the mini-plan or mini-plus or something. -- (Interjection) -- You can see what the fellows have on their mind. So I hope that my honourable friend understands what I'm trying to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, it's quite interesting to hear the debate going on as to what should be included in Section 49.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Medical Service, after what we just heard anyway.

MR. FROESE: Well, that's exactly what I'm speaking of, the amendment that is before us to include the physiotherapists. I was impressed with the presentation that was made in Law Amendments the other day by the party that made this presentation and I think they had a valid case, but I would like to know just what are the costs involved. How much would this increase the premiums if this were included. The other day we heard about the fringe benefits and they bandied the 240 thousand figure around. Nobody explained how they arrived at 240 thousand at that time. I would like to know at this time, by the people proposing, if they have any figures to give us the figures as to what the possible costs might be, or maybe the Minister could give us if he has the information available.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is the very thing that I've spoken about before, that these will be the planks in the next election, and should we have an election this summer I'm sure you'd find a list that you would probably not even be able to get on the page that would be included under Section 49 if there was an election called, because this is the type of legislation that lends itself to that and this is a thing that might well happen. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for St. John's says we should have an election every year so that we can make progress. I am not sure that I'd like to see too much progress in this way because there is the matter of costs involved and that the people of this province haven't really asked

(MR. FROESE Cont'd.).... for this. This is being imposed on them. I personally — no one has contacted me and asked that this particular legislation should be brought in. Not a single one. Yet, on the other hand, many many people have told me that they don't want compulsory Medicare and that they don't want this program. So on that basis I will not vote for the amendment that is being proposed.

..... continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, when Dr. Tanner made the presentation to Law Amendments Committee the other day he, as you recall, was all for throwing out that section that refers to the chiropractors and the optometrists -- well he didn't have so much against the optometrists -- but what he was saying was this: What is wrong with offering the public two plans, one to include the basic medical needs and then another one to include all of the fringe benefits, so to speak? And I thought that it was a pretty good kind of an argument that he had, because what he was saying was, let's have just a basic plan at a premium and then for those individuals that want a plan with all the fringe benefits, offer them one on a voluntary basis for an additional premium. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that for twenty-five years, I guess, MMS had three plans. They probably originally started out with one but because of public demand they offered the three plans, and I wonder if the government has given any consideration to that at all because, as I said before, Mr. Chairman, I'm one of the thousands in the province that carry this United Health Insurance plan; I'm also one of the fellows that can't buy Mediplus for the simple reason they won't sell it to me.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Because I'm not in a group of ten. They will not accept any groups of less than ten, and ten employees I think they must enroll 100 percent. So I can't buy them, I can't buy all of these other fringe benefits at all. But it seems to me that the government could offer two plans without too much trouble, the same as MMS has done in the past. I wonder if consideration has been given to this recommendation that was made by Dr. Tanner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Chairman, I think that I've got this . . . and I'd ask the Member of the New Democratic Party to listen to this, and this is my explanation. Now I intend to vote against the amendment, and if defeated this is the amendment that I propose to make: That the proposed Section 49 (1) of The Manitoba Medical Services Act as set out in Section 26 of Bill 33 as printed, be amended by striking out the words "chiropractic or optometric services or to both" in the second line thereof, and substituting therefor the words: "health services including drugs other than medical services."

Now the reason for this, as I say, that doesn't mean that all these services I'm in favour of, but I think that -- you see the Federal Government is not making any contribution to these at all. There might come a day that they decide for some reason or other to make a contribution to a specific named one, maybe the physiotherapist, maybe the chiropodist, maybe the chiropractor, I don't know; but if they do, well then the government would be in a position, if they feel that this is wise, to go ahead and have this covered. In this way we do not select anybody, we do not play favorites with anybody in this motion. As I say, it's not suggesting now -- and I want this clearly understood -- I'm not suggesting by making this motion, I say to the Minister . . . go ahead, I want you to cover all these things now. This is not what I'm doing at all. And this is something that definitely the government should not object to, because I'm saying: when you feel that you should or that you can or that you're getting help from Ottawa, you might select any of them. And this is all that this amendment is for, but the only way I could have this done, I can't amend your amendment now, I'll have to vote against your amendment and present this after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSON: I'd just like to say a few words just simply to say to the Committee that I certainly regard the physio and occupational therapists as a very important and increasingly important part of the medical team. Members will recall that the School of Physio and Occupational Therapy was initiated back in 1961, 1962 at the Rehab Hospital, and once the school was initiated, gradually the benefits and the knowledge of the values of these services have been made increasingly aware to the practicing physician to a point where it enjoys a very high regard by everyone, and they're doing an excellent job. Now physio, occupational and speech therapy, when provided to a patient who has been admitted as an inpatient in any hospital, is an insured service under the Hospital Plan, and the larger hospitals who have these people on staff provide for these costs in their budgets. And in other hospitals, therapist services have been provided through the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society on the fee-for-service basis, and in this regard the hospital budgets that in its budget for such things as was mentioned the other day by the Member from Selkirk; home care programming is increasing, and since 1962, when we started to beam in on this a bit more than in the past, has been an outpatient service, as we

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . know, in the Rehab Hospital, in the municipal hospitals, Assiniboine Hospital, Dauphin Extended Treatment Hospital, and more recently the Swan River. Wherever we got the extended treatment units going in the province these services are made available, and the Children's Hospital, rather than duplicate facilities and so on, refers its children up to 16 years of age over across the street to the Rehabilitation Hospital, so this makes maximum use of their facility and the billings to the Commission for treatment provided at Children's is done through the Rehab Hospital by an agreement. Now it was restricted at first because of really the numbers and the fact that the familiarity of our practicing physicians with these benefits was not fully utilized I imagine, how it was to put them in these extended treatment facilities, but we've referred this matter to the Commission who advise me they have the extension of physiotherapy and occupational therapy to the outpatients under active consideration as where there are the facilities and so on there shouldn't be much of a problem, and of course to home care programs; and without in any way taking a thing away from the excellent work these people are performing, it's the collective opinion that this is the proper place probably for them to be budgeted through the Hospital Commission. Members mentioned that about 80 percent of these services are done in hospitals - that is, in extended treatment and active treatment hospitals. I think the next step is extending more so to outpatients of our hospitals and personnel into hospital-based home care programs at this time. So it was not intended to include them in the provisions of this bill and I think that would be the best answer, to recognizing these services and making them available to the people of the province. Of course, occupational therapists are being encouraged into our mental hospitals too, where we can use the several skills which they bring to us. Furthermore, the decision to proceed with -- the Corporation to proceed with the development of programs as Bill 49 suggests in the two areas here, is a matter which has been given the fullest consideration and we would like to proceed with the bill as it is.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister will comment on the statement that was made in committee that there are occasions when patients have been kept in hospitals for the purpose of receiving treatment, therapy treatment, who would otherwise have been released from the hospital except for the fact that the cost of the therapist is not covered except through the hospital. And if that statement is correct, then I must say I believe it probably is correct that where you could provide a therapy service out of the hospital it is being done in the hospital because the patient can't afford to pay for it out of the hospital and it's not covered. Now is that a fair statement?

MR. JOHNSON: Well that's a pretty broad statement but I have a case I'm fully aware of this summer, a very severe accident case as just an example, who received very serious injuries, and as soon as he could be released he was released and brought to the hospital each day to the Rehab where all the facilities are, for hydrotherapy and this sort of thing. So there is through that centre a very active outpatient department service available, and we think this is where the extension -- this is what the Commission feel, the extension of the physiotherapy to the outpatient sector is the thing to do at the present time, and the physicians I have spoken to say the service that's made available through these hospitals on an outpatient basis would be most satisfactory to many of them.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . question. In what hospitals are the physiotherapists covered under the Manitoba Hospital Plan?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, physio-occupational speech therapy are provided to any patient as an insured -- who has been admitted as an inpatient to a hospital. These services are shareable by the Commission on an inpatient basis. On the outpatient basis the Manitoba Rehab Hospital, the Winnipeg Municipals, the Assiniboine which is at Brandon, as you know - the longer term facility there - Dauphin, Swan River where we have extended treatment facilities - it's available on an outpatient basis. I think we want to extend it in the major hospitals on the outpatient basis and . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Physiotherapy.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes - and occupational, both, and into the community.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one of the problems involved with this whole area, apparently the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society was getting federal monies in which to carry out their programs and I guess perhaps they were subsidizing their per patient cost in the home - apparently a lot of physiotherapists work for this organization CARS - and now the Federal Government has apparently cut off their grant and they have to charge something like

(MR. DOERN cont'd) \$8.00 per patient per treatment. This is causing quite a hardship on that society and on the people who are using their services, and I think that by including the physiotherapists in this plan it's a logical extension. There are federal monies available for it, and I don't see what the Minister's problem is.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I have a standing vote, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

For the benefit of the members that were not in the House at the time the question was asked, we are voting on the amendment by the Honourable Member for St. John's to Section 26.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 23, Nays 29.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the proposed Section 49 (1) of The Manitoba Medical Services Act as set out in Section 26 of Bill 33 as printed be amended by striking out the words "chiropractic or optometric services or both" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the words "health services other than medical services and including drugs."

MR. LYON: . . . amendment might require to be put in the hypothetical . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You're good at that. How about you fixing it?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I think the way the amendment is, simply leaving in the hands of the Minister the right to do this by regulation, therefore it's not saying include this in the bill at the moment. So I think it's perfectly in order; it merely gives my honourable friend the flexibility that he talks to us about, which he desires so much in other sections of his bill.

MR. LYON: I get your point. -- (Interjection) --

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education - he's talking about our colleagues in Ottawa. That's just it, and there might be the time where they might decide that they want drugs in there, and I feel that you should be in a position to go ahead and take advantage of that. There might be that, after you've studied the question of the physiotherapist, that you might decide that you're saving money and accomplishing something and doing something for the people in rural Manitoba. This is why I'm doing that. I wasn't - and I explained this - I wasn't against the physiotherapist, but I don't think that we should start naming one or the other, especially in view of the fact that I'm darn sure that chiropractors will stay in there, and I don't think that this is fair. I would at least -- now we're not going to start this battle. If you pass this, this is fine you won't have any battle; if not you're going to start pitting one against the other, and they'll say, if we had a Cabinet Minister from our profession in there, maybe we'd be in. This is what they're going to say. Some of them might. So, I think that this is the best way. Now, you're not going to get anybody mad. I'm not suggesting that they should all be in because, as I say, there are some that I don't think that should be covered now, for the premiums are too high now. I would say that if -- I might as well say it now, that if I had my choice, I would go along with the optometrists now, because of the necessity, of shortage of doctors, of specialists in the country, we need the optometrists, and I would not put anybody else for the time being. You were saying yourself that you've got to start slowly. This is a compulsory plan. Let's try to take the necessities to start with. Then you've got this, what is it? This Mediplus that is ready, willing and able to come in and cover all these things. So I think that this should be done, and people that do not believe in chiropractors or physiotherapists, all right; they don't have to be covered under this. But this way -- and I can't see where this government, there's something wrong with this government after fighting to have this, to have all the latitude possible, if they don't accept this. I don't know what's the matter with this government. They're just being pigheaded. They don't want to do anything that this side suggests. If you want to be flexible, there's your chance, and you might see that after this study on physiotherapists, you weren't ready to accept this right away. All right. I know that you didn't have to put it into force right away, but if you include physiotherapists, you might feel that you are expected to do it right away because you're going to go ahead with the optometrists and the chiropractors. Now, there's nothing like that. You can study and then in about 5 or 6 months, you can go ahead and feel -- you might see that you are actually going to save money. Well nobody will be against it then. So this is all I'm suggesting. If you want all the latitude, all the chance - there it is. So if you want to vote against it, I don't know what's the matter with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we went through this debate when the original Bill 68 was debated, and I think we made it clear that the provision of health services should not be limited just to medical practitioners but that there are other aspects. Now certainly I think that, as of two years ago, we were in support of this principle which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has presented, and that's to give wide latitude, and let us remember, Mr. Chairman - and I'm really surprised that the House Leader questioned whether or not this amendment should have the permission of the Lieutenant-Governor or . . . the Governor consider - the government making money on medicare. We figured out they're making around \$4 million which they are pouring into general revenue of the government and therefore actually they are the beneficiaries of this plan, and surely we don't need their -- we don't have to ask them to give consideration to the raising of funds. The fact is that they are benefiting by the introduction of this plan to the extent of an admitted \$3.9 million. So -- (Interjection) -- Well, they've already adopted the power to deal with assignments so that there's that in as well.

Now, the principle proposed is one, of course, which is acceptable. I would hope that in the describing of health services that should be covered, one will include drugs, and that's mentioned specifically. One will include the cost that might well be involved for home care, which is so important, to take away the drain on hospitals and the demand on hospital beds, which means the visiting nurse, which means the practical nurse, who comes in and who attends to the needs of a patient at home and thus saves money. I would hope it would be recognized that the person who is ill and cannot work is suffering and his family is suffering in that he is not going to have any income coming in to support his family and provide the food that they need simply because he's sick. And I think that's part of the health requirements that a person who is ill needs, and therefore he does need to have compensation for time lost because of illness, and I'm not saying -- I'm not worried about \$10,000 and 20,000-a-year men. They're the men who should be paying for the plan. I'm saying there should be a limit, of course. And of course the whole question of the care of teeth is so closely related to the general health of the body that I don't think I have to elaborate on it, so that what the proposed amendment is, which of course I support as stated, is to let the government know that in the setting of the working by the corporation of the provision of health services, we encourage them to do all that it is possible and within the means of the people to carry out a health service, or provision of health services; for the benefit of all the people and we only urge on them: don't use this to augment your income. Don't use this scheme to fill the pockets of the general treasury. That is an abuse of the scheme of which you are now guilty. Use the scheme for the benefit of the people and if you feel that money is coming from the Federal Government which is worth \$3.9 million, use it for the benefit of the people under health requirements, not for the filling of the general revenue coffers of the provincial government. And to that extent we've got \$3.9 million which I say you are misusing, use it for purposes and, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface made it possible, for such purposes as you think fit into the general concept of the health plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have not taken much part in this debate, the main reason being that I recognize that I'm not an authority on health services. I won't make many more statements because they might be used against me by some of the other members here later on, but it's probably known anyway that I'm not a great advocate of the so-called social services and their compulsory extension. I'm not quite in the category of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, but I don't find it too difficult to find some enthusiasm for some of the principles he espouses here.

The one thing that I wanted to say, and I've been looking at this clause 26 ever since this bill was laid on our desks, one thing I wanted to check on, admitting that I'm not an authority at all, just a layman when it comes to this type of legislation, but I've been wondering why we would include chiropractors and not include osteopaths, because it seems to me - and I'm not unfriendly to the chiropractors in any way at all - but it seems to me that the osteopaths are an exceptionally well-trained group of professional people and I think that their record of performance in the city here, and in the province, was very good. I think I know the answer in practical terms as to why they aren't included. I believe that they have just about disappeared from the province of Manitoba. I believe that the few that are still with us are getting so far along in age that they're doing very little. My honourable friend the Minister indicates that there is one, and if he's still practising then I wish him well. I think they have made a very worthwhile

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . contribution.

Incidentally, I am not unfriendly to the chiropractors. I wasn't in the morning that Dr. Tanner was speaking about them in the Committee or I would have probably tried to defend them a little bit. Where I think the chiropractors make their mistake, and it's a general one - and there are particular, many individuals that are honourably excepted from it, I think - in general I think where they make their mistake is really convincing themselves that they are able to treat a good many things that they're not able to treat. I think where the medical profession makes its mistake is that, because they feel that the chiropractors are unable to treat a good many things, they overlook the fact that they can do a lot of good in certain fields.

Mr. Chairman, there just isn't any doubt that the chiropractors can do a lot of good in certain fields. When I first was in this House sitting over there where the Honourable - the seat that's vacant at the moment because of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland being ill - there was sitting in the seat where my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone now sits, a chiropractor by the name of Ivans. Ivans was very, very famous as a parliamentarian. He deserved to be famous as a chiropractor too, because I know, of personal knowledge, several of the members of this House that he treated for what we farmers call sore backs, or a crick in the back, if you like that. I know several ones, but two of them personal friends of mine who had suffered for years and had been treated by the medical profession, and they weren't able to do very much good for them. And Bill Ivans, with just one or two adjustments, cured those two fellows that they never were bothered with that again. Now, I'm not advertising for the chiropractors. I have never been to one - never. But I do say we should give them credit for the things that they can do, and I repeat: I think they make their mistake by extending their services too far. But don't let us make the other mistake of saying that because they make some mistakes themselves in over-extending, that we should deny the services that they can give, because they can give them. And so can some of these other people. And I don't think we should deny the healing art to anybody. Now, how you write the rules to tell the chiropractors to stay just in their own field, I don't know, and this is one of the troubles; I'm sure some of them are aware of it themselves. And yet, how you put it into an Act like this, of how you can limit it to the right place.

However, that's too long a speech for somebody that just got up to inquire why the osteopaths aren't in. I don't think the osteopaths are here in such numbers, and I'm afraid that the one that's still here is not very active, is he? Well I'm glad if he is. I think they're a good profession, but I think as a matter of principle we should not limit to one class of the profession and by limiting exclude the others, because it just doesn't seem sensible to me. So - maybe you won't have gathered up to date which side of this amendment I'm on - I think this is a good argument for the proposition that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface puts before you. Leave it to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And I'm not usually an advocate of that policy. I usually say that the important matters should be put into the Act. I believe in that. I believe in putting just as much into the Act as possible. I believe in limiting as far as possible what is left to decision by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. But the difficulty that I see here is to de-limit the spheres, and I think we've de-limited it too greatly here when we particularize. Even though we say that it's only under certain conditions that they shall come in here, we still are putting those services in a preferred position. So why not, why not take this suggestion that the honourable member has made and leave the bringing in of these other health services to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And I certainly want to, in tribute to what the old timers in the field did in the past - we had one of them in Portage la Prairie - I want to mention the fact that I think the osteopaths did a good job and they should not be excluded by failing to mention them when you do mention one of the other healing arts; it, in my opinion, is rather closely allied but not quite as well-trained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we have the motion read out? I'm not sure just what it contains.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the proposed Section 49 (1) of The Manitoba Medical Services Act as set out in Section 26 of Bill 33 as printed, be amended by striking out the words "chiropractic or optometric services or both" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the words "health services including" -- (Interjection) -- "including health services other than medical services" - this writing isn't very good . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well you tell Ray; he wrote it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. I don't know whether I should start all over again or not. It's all stroked out and reworded in here. In other words, "health services other than medical services including drugs." We'll make sure that it's in the proper form in the book here anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. The question is, the amendment by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 23; Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost. The Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness and as a matter of principle, I would like to move (I'll be prepared to write this out in a moment) that the word "osteopathic" be inserted immediately following the word "chiropractic" in the second line of Section 26, 49 (1), as it says in the Bill. Now I doubt that I need to write that out because I think everybody knows exactly what I mean, but if you prefer I'll write it out.

Then we need to add "either" or "any of them" or something, following, but the principle is in the first motion. Do you want it written?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tallin, I think is trying to . . . The Minister of Health.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . Member for Lakeside. I don't know if there are any osteopathic physicians practising in the province. I honestly would have to look into that -- (Interjection) -- Well, just a moment. Because the osteopathic schools in the United States have now joined the medical fraternity and they are graduating joint physicians at this time. They've really become part of the medical team.

MR. CAMPBELL: Do they still carry their own name, might I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JOHNSON: I think they're known as doctors of medicine now, and osteopathic physicians, I believe. I would have to check that again, but my understanding is that the schools are combined into medical schools and -- there may be some schools left. I would have to again refresh my memory on this so I don't know really what the standing or the impact of this amendment would be.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling us that the present Act would include osteopathic services? Is the Minister saying that the present Act permits the paying for osteopathic services or that . . .

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I didn't know of any osteopathic physicians in the province. No, they wouldn't be included as medical men.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my only point would be that if some should come here, if they still carry on under that name - the Minister's information on that subject would be much better than mine, I'm sure - but if he assures me that they do not now carry on under that name . . .

MR. JOHNSON: That's what I don't know.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, could we inquire whether we have an Act of this province that establishes the osteopaths as a society in some way, with certain powers and restrictions . . . ?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might help members of the committee with a historical review. There is an Osteopathic Act; there is one Doctor of Osteopathy who is practising in the city at the present time. The reason that osteopathy hasn't increased in numbers in this province is that at the time of the passing of The Osteopathic Act their practice was limited solely to manipulation, and over the years, as the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services has pointed out, the area of practice in osteopathy has expanded to include manipulation and surgery and in many of the American states there is the blending or the melding of the two practices. This has been the problem with osteopathy within the Province of Manitoba because of the limitation to manipulation alone.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get in the debate here. The old osteopath that settled in Gimli was a herbalist and a good one. That is, he did a little practical medicine and that was known as the homeopathic -- oh, that was the homeopathic physician and some of them, didn't they also call themselves osteopaths. They were mixed up. But I don't know where I can get this information. I noticed the Deputy Minister in the gallery and possibly he could confirm, as the Minister said, under which branch of the healing arts they would fall at

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . the moment.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, we looked it up in the telephone directory, the yellow pages, and they have Osteopathic Physicians, there are two listed: Dr. Frederick H. Deeks and Dr. G. Glen Murphy.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want a standing vote?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Members.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 24; Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: . . . move the deletion of the word "chiropractic" and other necessary changes in this section. Well, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of simplicity I wish to remove the word "chiropractic" and then any other necessary grammatical changes in that section that would follow from the deletion of that word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . a written motion, so we can . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we are asked to vote on this I think that . . .

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in my opening comment that I am speaking as an individual and I'm not speaking or putting forward a party position. I expect that some of my colleagues will support this move and others will not.

I think that when we listened to the presentations made in the committee by the numerous medical spokesmen, I for one was struck by the strength and by the number of medical people who spoke against the inclusion of chiropractors, and I think that this question can be dealt with in one of two ways. There are people who would support this amendment might do so on medical grounds, in the sense of taking the word of physicians and surgeons; others might do so on the grounds of priorities, that there are other services that should be included ahead of chiropractic services.

One of the briefs that we were presented with was the brief of the Quebec Royal Commission, which had some very interesting comments on this whole field. For example, the brief pointed out that chiropractic services was, in their opinion, a treatment, that it was not a specialty, that it was something in the nature of manipulation which is limited to the spinal column and the pelvis, so that is a rather restricted specialty in their opinion. The main point made in the Quebec brief, and I think the main point made by the various doctors who testified before Law Amendments Committee is, I think, the problem that chiropractors are not qualified to make what might be described as a complete medical diagnosis, that due to their theories and practices and so on they have a view of disease which is I think peculiar to their own profession, whereas people in what might be described as the general medical profession do what I think is called a differential diagnosis which takes in many more theories, many more possibilities and so on.

If I were to mention the main recommendation of the Quebec Royal Commission, they suggest, for example, that chiropractic services should be limited to certain kinds of manipulation, that this should only be used after a sound, accurate and valid differential diagnosis, and that this can only be made by a person who has received a far more complete training in this field than that presently given to chiropractors, so I think their point there is that you do one of two things: either chiropractors should have a more complete background in training before they are allowed to make a diagnosis, or that the diagnosis can only be made by a physician. The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada does not approve of doctors making referrals to chiropractors, and if you look at other Acts like the New York Act and so on, one can see that chiropractors are limited in what they can do. For example, they cannot engage in medical, surgical, paramedical specialties. They cannot perform surgery; prescribe, administer, dispense drugs, etc. etc.

So Mr. Chairman, I think that if one were to take the advice of the people who supposedly know, namely the people we are dealing with in the Medicare Plan, the overwhelming number of physicians and surgeons and specialists and so on, and their opinion, they are not in favour of the full recognition of chiropractic services, and I think that they gave us their opinion, those who were represented at our hearing, that they were not in favour of the inclusion of chiropractors in the plan.

(MR. DOERN cont'd)

I think that another major point is the question of why should chiropractors be included in the plan when there are so many other specialties that could be included ahead of them. We made the case to the best of our ability for physiotherapists, and I think when you're taking a question of priorities, I think that the physiotherapists have a much stronger case. They are recognized by the Federal Government, perhaps to a greater extent by the medical profession; they are now covered in certain areas, and so on. I think that if one were going to put a scale of priorities, one would put ahead of chiropractic services, optometrists who are included in this section of the Act, physiotherapists, perhaps drugs, perhaps dental care, and so on. But certainly, if one looks at a scale of priorities, it strikes one as peculiar that the chiropractors should be included ahead of so many of these other areas in the medical field. There's undoubtedly going to be a cost for their inclusion which is a part of the figure of a million and a half which apparently includes chiropractors and optometrists, and I don't think we're getting a penny of federal aid for the inclusion of chiropractors in this plan. Maybe the Minister could clarify that if there's any doubt about that statement.

The public has used and the public does value the services of chiropractors and there are many other specialties that the public uses, some of which I suppose have the approval of the qualified physicians and surgeons and others that do not, and the public has this right in Manitoba to go and use chiropractors. I just question the value of why they should be included in the plan and I question this on the grounds that the medical profession argues that they should not and questions some of their medical training or ability, and in particular on the grounds of priority. I think that there are so many other items like the physiotherapists and occupational therapists who should be included ahead of them and that chiropractors should come further down the list. So Mr. Chairman, this is why I move this amendment and I hope that some of the other members will support it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that many questions should be answered before we have a vote on this. For instance, I expect the Minister of Health to tell us why he selected -- he was certainly one of the ones that had an awful lot to say in this -- why he selected the chiropractors. He has refused drugs; he doesn't want to be responsible to pay drugs. He's refused physiotherapists; he's refused osteopaths. Why has he selected chiropractors? There must be some reason and we're entitled to know. I can't understand this government who wanted to have a lot of leeway to make this plan work. They've refused the motion and as far as I'm concerned it was taking them right off the hook, wasn't singling out anybody in particular and say well these people yes and the others no.

Now I want the Minister of Health to tell me, the medical doctor, does he agree with Dr. Tanner; does he agree with Dean Fyles; or doesn't he? I think that we're entitled to know this; I want to know if the Corporation said yes, put the chiropractors there but nobody else. I'd like to know that. There are a few smiles and I detect that this is not the way it was done at all, and if this isn't the way it was done at all and if it is the reason that I think it was done for, boy this party in front of me is going to have its head examined. You were left off the hook. You didn't have to do that at all if you'd accepted my motion, but you didn't accept it. So now suffer the consequences and tell us why. Is it because one of your front benchers is a chiropractor? -- (Interjection) -- It's not that at all. Well I'm at a loss to understand then, unless the Minister of Health can stand up and say to me, "No, I don't agree with Dr. Tanner; I don't agree with Dr. MacFarland; I don't agree with Dean Fyles, I don't agree with any of those at all."

I don't want anybody to think that I'm against the chiropractors. This is not the point at all. But I cannot see why they are selected and not the others. I am against that. I am against that principle, and I'm against us going in this deal and including the chiropractors at this time when we were told that they could be covered under the private carriers, when this is a compulsory plan and you are saying no to drugs, you are saying no to dental before. We could have made another amendment and it wouldn't have been a childish amendment at all. We could have taken the word "chiropractor" out and substitute "dental care for children" let's say, dependent children, and maybe drugs. Does anybody here in this House feel that at times? Some of those drugs are vital. Some people can't live with drugs -- without drugs, I should say. I guess some people can't live with drugs either. But the case is that this is an important thing. And I agree that you have to do it gradually. I'm not suggesting that you should pile all this in, but why? Why was the term "chiropractor" included in this? I think that we should

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . know. The Minister of Health shouldn't have any secrets. He should tell us. There must be some reason. He stood up and said osteopaths no, drugs no, physiotherapists no, dental services, no. So why chiropractors? Before I know if I should support this motion, it might be that the Minister of Health will make a conferee out of me. We'll see that there is the need right now. Right now. This government doesn't want to take under them the right to say, well all right, maybe we'll include certain types of drugs that are drugs needed to prolong life or to keep certain people alive. We don't want this; we don't want to worry about the children's dental services or anything like that, but why we want chiropractors, chiropractic services are because of this, this, and that.

Now this was the idea of my amendment. Why single one out? Why play one against the other? There is no need for that. We were ready to trust the government in this. We were ready to say, well go ahead if in your talk with Ottawa you feel that you might be able to talk them into allowing, helping us with grants under drugs or certain things, well that you could put it in, or that after studying the business of physiotherapists you felt that this was needed and that we should include that, we're going to save money anyway, we'd go along with that. We're satisfied that the optometrists should be in right now because of the shortage of doctors and because they are needed in rural points. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm very interested in the remarks that I know the Minister of Health will favour us with at this time. I'm sure that he will give me the reasons why he and his colleagues have chosen to include the chiropractors in there and it might be that I would feel that I have no alternative but to reject the amendment. But I'm waiting very patiently, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I've said it before and I'll repeat it for my honourable member. The Corporation recommended that serious consideration be given to optometric and chiropractic services; the government made a conscious decision; the government has prepared the bill that is before you as a government measure. I have lots of personal views on lots of matters. Sometimes I may share lots of my personal views on this and other matters with my honourable friend but this is a matter of public policy. This is a government decision recommended to us following representations from the Farmers' Union, the Labour Movement, the municipal bodies in the province, who recommended very strongly that this be included, and at this time in the evolution of this massive program, these are the areas that we are entering into and recommending to the honourable members at this time. As we go along in the implementation of this scheme, both ourselves and other provinces may see extensions in various areas, but we thought it best to spell out those areas we're moving forward in at this time. I also explained to my honourable friend that the physio and occupational therapy groups who are such an essential part of the health team, we feel can be provided for in large measure to our people through the Hospital Services program in the province and home care programs based out of these facilities, and examine this very thoroughly in the coming year. But we have a big parcel on our plate. Getting the basic plan into operation today has been a massive task and these two services are going to be negotiated in the coming months.

MR. DOERN: . . . the Minister a question. He gave an explanation to me, I think last week, on this very question. He argued that the Medical Care Insurance Corporation recommended to the government that they include optometric and chiropractic services.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . serious consideration be given to these inclusions.

MR. DOERN: Fine. My question is: were there any other services that they recommended to you? It strikes me as peculiar that they only recommended two. It's the government's choice. Were there any other services like the physiotherapist services that were also recommended by that group? Drugs and so on.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we have no quarrel whatsoever with the physio and occupational therapists, and I think I've spoken on that twice this afternoon and I hope my honourable friend will understand what I've said.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should repeat my question. Were there any other recommendations made to the government by the Medical Care Insurance Corporation along the lines of chiropractors and optometrists? Were there any other suggestions that they had for you?

MR. JOHNSON: No, these two were specifically mentioned by the Corporation to us.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, were these recommendations made by letter? Is it possible that the members could have a copy of these letters? I think it was said a while ago that the Medical Review Committee would review all these things and would decide -- it would

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . be up to them to decide all these medical points here. If the Medical Review Committee should recommend that these chiropractors and so on should not be included in there, is it the intention of the government to drop these at a further date? Isn't that the purpose of the Medical Review Committee?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . still be negotiating with these two groups and the necessary review committee set up to deal with their particular professions.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister repeat his answer. I didn't hear anything at all. I don't know -- there was some talking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Churchill.

MR. DESJARDINS: Am I taking it then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister does not wish to answer these questions - the last question?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'll ever satisfy my honourable friend on my answer in this matter.

MR. DESJARDINS: It means he won't answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say a few words in support of the resolution. I realize this is the second time in two days that I am supporting the government and I'm not proud of myself but it seems to me that chiropractic services are very important, especially for the working people. I'm not really surprised that there are people in this Chamber that are against it. Obviously people who sit around, whether they're politicians or teachers or lawyers, don't need their services. The working people do. I think if you look at the record -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I think if we look at the record where there's construction workers, farmers, fishermen, miners, anybody that's doing hard work, if you look at the records, medical records - don't take anybody's work in this Chamber, look at their records - you'll find that there's a high incidence of back injuries. I've spent six and a half years underground and I would say I've seen a chiropractor as often as I've seen a doctor and I think this is true for most of the men working there, and the fact that the Compensation Board recognizes them and pays for their service I think speaks very well. Surely the government and this is -- I think most of the governments in Canada have compensation covering chiropractic services and I can't see the governments paying out good money to what Dr. Tanner referred to as quacks. We've heard reference that there was experts that spoke at that hearing. Well I think the best experts are people who use the services and Dr. Tanner was obviously prejudiced - anybody who listened to him would know he was prejudiced - and it's the same doctor -- or the people who spoke against chiropractors were doctors who have opted out. --(Interjection) -- Well he was for it. So I think we should discount the opinions of these experts and I hope that -- I'm not speaking for the party here, I want to make that clear. I think most of the party is going to vote for it but, personally speaking, I think it's a good motion and I'm certainly going to vote for it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I still want to have a few words on this particular amendment. When we speak of chiropractors who are we speaking of? Are we just speaking of those that are licensed in Manitoba and that have received training in Manitoba? I note there are various schools in the United States where people go to and get their training. Does this mean that we recognize any chiropractor? And what about those that are practising chiropractic and yet not probably licensed as such. Will they be able to enter the plan and will they be able to collect under the plan, because we have any number of people that are performing this service and I'm just wondering who will be entitled for payment under this plan.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd recommend my honourable friend to The Chiropractic Act of the province which sets out the terms and conditions of operations of chiropractors in Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health or the Minister of Labour if they could clarify that point about the Workmen's Compensation and Chiropractors. Does the Compensation Board allow workers who have hurt their back, for example, to go directly to a chiropractor or is it only after they have been referred to one by a physician?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . can attend a chiropractor under that Act and the reports are made to the Board. We could get you the details of their policy.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I personally intend to support the amendment, not because I'm opposed to chiropractors or that I have any suspicion that this might be some political maneuver or because they are not practitioners of the healing arts, but I feel, Mr. Chairman,

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . that if the Medicare plan is to succeed it ought to have practitioners of the healing arts within it who could and would work as a team. Now we haven't seen any evidence of this, Mr. Chairman, up until now. I'm sure -- well you attended the committee hearings on Friday morning and the bulk of the day was taken up with the matter, with a fight, a squabble between the doctors and the chiropractors, the one group claiming that they are quite capable of rendering service in the healing arts, the doctors on the other hand claiming the opposite.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we in this House are not in a position to determine whether the chiropractors are capable and qualified of doing that to which they lay claim. I believe that that is a decision that can best be made by people trained in that field, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a role for the chiropractor to play within the offering of services in provision of health to the people of Manitoba, then let the providers of those services settle this question first. I'm very disturbed by throwing together two groups of people and telling them that you're going to work together under the same plan when their philosophies are so different. They're opposed to one another; they do not work as a team, for what reason I don't know, but this became very evident last Friday that they do not, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the first responsibility of both groups, the doctors and the chiropractors, is to settle this issue between themselves. Let them determine what role each could play. If the doctors and chiropractors can work together, let them agree on the areas of responsibility of each, and when that is done, Mr. Chairman, I'll be most happy, if our amendment passes today, and if the government should choose to come back with a bill next year asking for the inclusion of chiropractors after this issue is settled, I'd be most happy to support it then. But at the present time, in view of the fact that there is this wide difference of opinion between the two, I find it difficult, in fact impossible, to include chiropractors under the existing Medicare plan.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get quite clearly the answer of the Minister. Is it very definite that the only recommendations that he got from his committee was that optometric and chiropractic services be included and they specifically did not include any other services? Is that the answer the Minister gave?

MR. JOHNSON: We have a recommendation from the corporation generally which said - and I have repeated this in a press release back when the premiums were announced and again now - that serious consideration be given by the government to the inclusion at this time of optometric and chiropractic services in the light of representations made to them, and the government takes full responsibility for accepting this extension. These other areas were considered by the government in its own right, fully recognizing the ambit and the discussion that would arise here today, and felt that the physiotherapy and occupational therapy personnel could be paid, and through the Hospital Commission with an extension of their services to outpatients at this time, that beyond this, as a matter of fact, and even in getting these particular sections under way it would take at least three months following the introduction of the medical program before they could deal with the machinery for this. So this was given the fullest consideration and this is clearly a government decision to include these two services in the coming months.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is rather evasive in his reply. He's playing with words here. A little earlier he said that this was a recommendation of, the association is it? The corporation. A recommendation of the corporation. When he was requested: was this the only recommendation of the corporation? he conveniently forgot to answer that. Now, he's changed his course again. He says the government accepts the responsibility for this decision. But the question is, what were the recommendations of the corporation? Were they merely optometric and chiropractic or were there other recommendations of the corporation, and if so, what were they and will the Minister give us the documents, the letter of recommendations by the corporation?

MR. JOHNSON: Now I'm sure that's privileged information to the Minister. I don't know if I have that. I would be prepared to table that. I'm not -- (Interjection) -- I wouldn't. I make perfectly clear to the honourable Leader of the Opposition that it was said, and I actually quoted the section in preparing the press release of two months ago, and I haven't got that release in front of me, where I said that serious consideration be given to the inclusion of optometric and chiropractic at this time. In looking into it further, we found we couldn't get those programs going along with our massive program on the first of April. With respect to other services, these were not mentioned by the corporation to me at that time in any written form. On

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) inquiring from the chairman of the corporation it was felt that the physio and occupational therapists be handled as I have outlined today. No other services. There are services such as representations we have had from other groups that I have had and no doubt your party has had, and consideration has not been given to them, and this is clearly a government decision to proceed with these two services at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to labour the point but the Minister said at the outset that this was on the recommendations of the corporation. Now, my question to the Minister is: did the corporation make these recommendations to him in writing, No. 1? Number 2. Were there only recommendations of optometry and chiropractic, or did they make other recommendations at the same time? And if they did make other recommendations at the same time, what were those recommendations?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the only two areas that consideration was given to were these two areas.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . by the corporation or by the government?

MR. JOHNSON: The corporation has been studying the matter of optometric services and chiropractic for some months and made a recommendation that serious consideration be given to these, pointing out, however, that they couldn't guarantee to initiate such programs on the target date of April 1st.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . by letter to the Minister?

MR. LYON: The honourable member knows full well that he is delving into a field of the private advice that was received by the government from its own civil service and corporations.

MR. MOLGAT: No. Mr. Chairman, would you ask the honourable gentleman to keep to the order of business. We're perfectly entitled to know on what basis my honourable friend got the information. — (Interjection) — Well, absolutely. We are entirely entitled to know whether this corporation, which was set up by this House, made a recommendation to the Minister in writing or not. Absolutely. My honourable friend is nine miles off track, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LYON: If I had more time I'd be prepared to argue with my honourable friend. It's a wonderful academic subject but I'm afraid he's wrong.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm quite prepared to take all the time that's necessary because, Mr. Chairman, we still don't know from the Minister exactly what the final recommendations of this corporation is. If the Minister said, "This has been my decision exclusively, and that of the government," then that's one thing. But he started off by saying this is on the basis of the recommendations of the corporation. Now, if that's the basis of the recommendation, then this House is entitled to know what are the recommendations of that corporation in total. And if they went beyond this, then the Minister has the responsibility to tell this House. When I ask him whether it was done by letter or verbally, I think he has a responsibility to tell this House. This corporation was established by this House.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't go any further than to say positively that the corporation recommended, without reference to these other areas of extension, that serious consideration be given at this time — this was about mid-January or a little later — to the inclusion of optometric and chiropractic. The government accepted this recommendation and gave it its consideration, and while the corporation told us to give serious consideration to these two at this time, the government made the decision to accept these two at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . hasn't answered my question, Mr. Chairman. And the corporation made no other recommendation?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, was the corporation asked to make a recommendation? — (Interjection) — Just a minute now. Just a minute. We've heard now for a couple of days that the doctors say this, the doctors say that, on opting out and opting in, and this is what they believe. This was all over television, it was explained in the newspapers and so on, and today we're asked a question. The Minister is not happy. He's saying, "Well, I don't know," he says, "we accept all responsibility." You're supposed to accept responsibility on the whole plan. Nobody's suggesting that you're not. But we want to know how you came about to select one instead of the other. And he's saying right away when I asked why, I asked him give us any reason why it's a need now, he said the corporation recommended this. Who's the corporation? If he'd said the Medical Review Committee, which that is their business to look after the health part of that, I'd understand, but who's the corporation? Maybe we should go a little further. Until not too long ago the Chairman of the Corporation was Dr. Tanner. I'm

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) darn sure he didn't recommend that. Is that why he re-signed? I think we're entitled to know. If the government want to say, "All right, this is some matter that concerns us; we don't want to tell you why," but don't try to blame the corporation when you know they can't say anything. This is a question that we were asked. We were asked . . .

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, nobody's blaming the corporation for anything. We're taking full responsibility for putting these two sections in this bill. We were told to give it serious consideration.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. The Minister is saying now that the corporation had nothing to do with it.

MR. JOHNSON: I told you - fourth time - they told us to give serious consideration to this area of optometric and chiropractic.

MR. DESJARDINS: They did, and they didn't say anything about any other -- they didn't say anything about drugs; they didn't consider that. They didn't consider dental care for children.

MR. JOHNSON: No, because no province in Canada has given consideration to any other areas except optometric and chiropractic and we were keeping our plan in concert with the other provinces in Canada.

MR. DESJARDINS: So they were copying provinces in Canada. You were worried about provinces . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, we have now reached the hour when the Committee should rise. We're at the last section. I just wonder if there's any disposition to complete the matter now that we're so close to having it done.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion to present.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . I had the floor and I intend to keep it.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, can we deal with this, because otherwise the committee has to rise. It's 5:30.

MR. CHERNIACK: We on this side, on our corner, are prepared to vote on the amendment now.

MR. FROESE: Well, as long as I will be permitted to make my statement on the motion that I want to present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the members that we vote on the amendment now?

MR. MOLGAT: Might I enquire of the House Leader what course of action do you then propose insofar as third reading? When would third reading be proposed?

MR. LYON: Hopefully, if there is agreement, we would try to conclude third reading now, if that's possible. Otherwise I would ask honourable members to give consideration to continuing until we do complete tonight, because it's getting more urgent that we should get the bill through.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer starting off at 8:00 o'clock again on this and proceed until we're finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. MOLGAT: That's agreeable by us if that's agreeable . . .

MR. LYON: That would be quite agreeable to us if it's agreeable to all the members of the House. We require unanimous consent.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes. The only question then becomes Private Members Day. Can we have an understanding we have some private members' business, because this is the last day this week. We will not be sitting on Friday. Would the government be agreeable to having private members day on some government day?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, again I confess I'm a little confused about what we discussed yesterday. I am under the impression that we did agree that if we go on today that the possibility of private members' discussion might go forward into Wednesday, and I think it's only fair that if we can't complete it today -- we are interested in getting this bill through without any obstruction of any kind, but we don't want to lose private members day because we're losing Friday anyway. If it can be agreed to go on Wednesday afternoon then . . .

MR. LYON: Well might I suggest this, that if there is the consensus there seems to be, that we go ahead at 8:00 o'clock tonight in Committee, see how much more time is required,

(MR. LYON cont'd) and then we can make whatever adjustments seem to be reasonable in the circumstances after we've completed the bill tonight. Will that be agreeable?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make another proposition in that case. Why not simply meet tonight at 8:00, proceed in Committee, proceed at third reading and then carry on with government business tonight, go into estimates, and let's spend tomorrow on private members' business, then we'll be right back where we were in the beginning. I think that we have given the government every co-operation insofar as this and I think it's reasonable - and just carry on government business all evening.

MR. LYON: That suggestion commends itself to us. That sounds reasonable. I think there would be trouble with the Clerk's office in the Order Paper but subject to our retaining our Order Papers from today, so that -- I think his Order Paper's already out at the printers for tomorrow and it would not contain the resolutions, but if members could remember to hang on to their Order Papers from today then . . .

MR. MOLGAT: By mutual agreement, we'd agree to work on today's Order Paper tomorrow.

MR. LYON: That sounds reasonable.

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