

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, May 4, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 14 students of Grades 7 and 8 standing of the Fairdale Public School of North Dakota. They are under the direction of Mr. Danny Lee.

And we also have 8 students of senior high standing of the Max Bass High School of North Dakota under the direction of Mr. Fee. These are our guests from the United States this morning.

We also have 34 students of Grade 9 standing of the Sisler High School under the direction of Mr. Swerhun and Mr. Shtatleman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a return to an Order of the House No. 21, dated April 9, 1973, on motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

I'd also like to table a Return to an Address for Papers on a motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina dated March 28, 1973. I indicated at the time that it would probably be a nil return, which it is, Mr. Speaker.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement with respect to new qualifications for fishing licenses on Lake Winnipeg. Basically, Mr. Speaker, I have copies of the statement for distribution, I don't intend to read it. It sets out how people can qualify for a license. Essentially we're using the same qualifications as we have last year with also a provision for a point system for entry into the fishery. I don't think it's something that I need read, I'm giving it to the honourable members.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that as I mentioned during my Estimates, this is not something for which I expect there will be a great approval or no criticism. In setting qualifications it's always a problem, some people will not qualify and will no doubt register their disapproval. At the same time it's generally considered necessary that there be a limit to the number of fishermen and also a quota to the amount of fish that is taken from the lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, responding to the Minister's statement with respect to the licensing and quota arrangements for the fisheries on Lake Winnipeg, I welcome the statement this morning. Certainly we haven't had an opportunity to digest it and there undoubtedly will be some remarks to be made after studying the document presented to us. However, Mr. Speaker, I do take this occasion, I think the occasion affords me to again remind the Honourable Minister and the government that we have a tendency to consider or place so much of our emphasis with respect to fishing on our one major lake. I appreciate very much that Lake Winnipeg is the major fishing lake that we have in the province but there are other lakes and specifically Lake Manitoba. The Lake Manitoba fishermen over the years have felt that they have not always received the attention of governments per se and this government being no exception to that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I only would hope that in the announcements, in the general overview of policy of this government of this Minister, that they would take sufficient time and take sufficient consideration for the specific unique problems that the Manitoba fisheries people face when considering fishing problems generally in the province. I reserve further comments with regards to the statements made by the Minister to such a time that we have had occasion to look at the statement more closely. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Manitoba have agreed to table the agreement on the Hog Marketing Agency interprovincial that has been set up . . . (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports. Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions . The Honourable Member for Lakeside .

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question at the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Several days ago, probably last week, I asked a question with respect to whether or not his department of Water Control was in a position to carry out certain channel improvements and dike work having to do with improving the water levels in the marshes at St. Ambrose in the Delta Marshes. I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to respond to that question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I feel rather certain that the question has been conveyed to the department but I haven't received an answer yet. I'll check on it today.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question having to do with the same concern. It's my understanding that the Fairford Dam is now virtually sealed off and has been for a considerable period of time in order to maintain the water levels at Lake Manitoba. Has the Minister and is the Department undertaking any further work at the structure to insure that what could be a very dry year doesn't in fact prove to be disastrous for the Lake Manitoba area generally? I'm referring specifically to the valuable marshland in and about that great water body.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again, lest my memory fails me I believe I did make an answer to the question as to the actions on the Fairford Dam; and again, going from memory, it wasn't that it was entirely sealed off there was a flow permitted. But I'd like to take the honourable member's question in its balance as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same Minister of Mines in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Has he had an opportunity to ascertain and determine whether the question asked yesterday respecting the firing or resignation of Richard Larratt the President of Phoenix Data has in fact occurred, has Mr. Larratt been removed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to trust to my memory again and I know that I could be wrong as I once was before. That I heard on a television news report that the Honourable Member for - the Leader of the Liberal Party said that Mr. Larratt had been fired, and if he did not know that information and was relying on it before he got an answer from the department, I would think that his conduct in referring to the man as having been fired and now asking a question as to whether that is so or whether he resigned is an unusual procedure. I did speak to the official of the Fund yesterday and I was advised that Mr. Larratt had resigned, had put in his resignation, I believe effective May 1, and again I'm stating that from memory.

MR. ASPER: Does the First Minister have - rather, not the First Minister, the Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, does he have a copy of the resignation or termination of employment statement?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't, and I would like to try to indicate that the shift in staff positions in any of these agencies of the Crown as well as a departmental shift is not something which I ordinarily would make a statement of the House. The only thing is that my honourable friend said that somebody had been fired, which is a reflection on the person I would suppose, so I tell you that my knowledge is he has resigned. When my honourable friend suggested that my Deputy Minister had left because I was suppressing him I produced a letter which showed it wasn't the case, and if the honourable member is going to make allegations for the purpose of having them rectified by the department I guess we'll have to do that. But ordinarily the changing of personnel from one place to another happens in administration and it also happens in the electoral field.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Taking into account or in view of the fact that major losses have been suffered, is the Government, is the Manitoba Development Corporation reviewing its policy of initiating or ownership of private business?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the premise upon which the question is based makes it very difficult to answer on the oral question period. Yesterday there was an assumption from two figures, (1) expenditures between a certain period and moneys received between a certain period that major losses had been suffered. I don't think that any accountant would justify that conclusion from two figures. Further, Mr. Speaker, it is common in various industrial endeavours in a start-up operation and in the first year to show a loss and yet be in a better position than you were the year before. For instance, it is possible for instance that the Minnedosa Distillery would have shown a loss on operations in its first year but the owners of Minnedosa Distilleries were in a position of being able to translate their assets into a very substantial profit. So I don't think that one can make a judgment on the basis of my honourable friend's question,

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGregor (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the First Minister. Does the First Minister concur with Senator Walter Mondale, Democrat, Minnesota, in his speech last night regarding the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is stating or is going to indicate an assertion from a speech and asking whether the member will concur or not which is irregular. Would the honourable member rephrase his question.

MR. MCGREGOR: Then, Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister reply in a positive manner to the Senator?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet an opportunity to comprehend fully the nature of my honourable friend's question. It relates to some statement made by Senator Walter Mondale the senior senator from Minnesota. I can advise my honourable friend the Member for Virden that Senator Mondale is, I regard as a very good friend, but whether that in itself will be sufficient to mean anything in this context I do not know. All I do know, Sir, is that there have been representations made to the U. S. authorities with respect to the best, the optimum routing for the pipeline to carry the crude oil product from the Alaska north slope but that is a matter of very intensive and intense internal political controversy in the U. S. and I doubt very much if there is anything that Canadians can do or say that will determine or influence that decision. Still we'll make representation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In the light of the answers that he gave to me yesterday regarding pumping of water, I wonder if the Minister would not seriously consider taking a survey of the province probably through the municipalities and ascertain the real need at the moment to implement the program of water pumping in order to collect what water there is in potholes and sloughs now into already existing water reservoirs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I should advise the Honourable Member for Arthur that the field staff are fully acquainted with the program and are equally acquainted with the local needs and that our field staff are perfectly capable of determining that in consultation with local authorities; and if there is a need I'm sure that the service will be provided and will be advertised at the local level.

MR. WATT: Supplementary question then. I'm quite sure that his staff are capable of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. WATT: My question is, has the Minister had any indication from his staff, the Ag Reps or his staff throughout the province, if there is a need for water pumping at this time?

MR. USKIW: The Honourable Member for Arthur is at least a month and a half late with that question. We have been very much aware of it a long long time ago.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question put to me by the Member for Rhineland having to do with whether or not credit unions are utilizing the Canada Deposit Insurance Act. My information at this point is that the Act has not yet been amended

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. USKIW cont'd) to allow them to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Arthur place his last supplementary.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that I am a month and a half late in posing this question. Then I ask the Minister why is it that he gave me the answer yesterday that equipment had been ordered and he still doesn't know when it's going to be delivered?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I have to reply to the member in the same way that he puts his question and if he would recall that these questions were answered on many occasions over the last number of weeks then I wouldn't have to respond to him in that way. But he persists in trying to, I suppose, trying to get headlines on something that has already been resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. --(Interjection) The Honourable member has had his supplementary. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government given approval or will the government give assistance, financial assistance, to the Town of Altona in the construction of their sewage lagoon and to what extent?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, during the Estimates I indicated to my friend the Member for Rhineland that we would have very good things for people in his constituency, and as I understand it they do qualify for a grant based on works done in 1972. The estimate is somewhere in the order of \$40,000.00

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Has the conversion of Mount Carmel Clinic into a community health centre been completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development):(Springfield): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. In view of the Minister's statement some time ago that it would be completed by April 1st, is there any delay in the matter and can the Minister table the working papers in respect to the conversion?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I am subject to correction but I don't believe I have given a date. The documents, that is the negotiation with the Mount Carmel and its staff is not ready for tabling at this stage. The findings and the decision arrived at will be something made public automatically like any other facility that is operating directly through government departments or agencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): The other day the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie asked questions in this House, scandalous questions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: The Premier answered, the Premier made answer and I want to further elaborate on the answer that was given to that scandalous question. --(Interjection)-- Well the honourable member can reflect on whether it's scandalous or not after I've made the answer.

The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie suggested in his question that the Attorney-General's Executive Assistant and his wife had gone on a junket to Norway House in a government aircraft. The Premier yesterday indicated that in no way, shape or form had the Attorney-General's Executive Assistant or his wife been to Norway House in any way, shape or form; and it should have been added that on no occasion that he can recall has he ever been involved in any government aircraft except if you consider Air Canada government aircraft or perhaps he had some usage of government aircraft during the war.

Now I expected the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party would apologize for the seeming indifference that that party has to truthful questions in this House. Smear tactics

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) should not go unanswered, and although my Executive Assistant is not a civil servant he is not someone that is in this House and that can protect his reputation. Honourable members should have some concern about truth in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I just want to clarify one point. Did the Minister rise on a question of privilege or was he just responding to a question?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think I made it quite clear that a scandalous question was asked. It was responded to in part. I finished the reply today.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask you to take into consideration whether that kind of a reply to a question is in order in this Chamber. If the Minister has risen on a question of privilege I think it would have been perhaps a valid one, but rising just to respond to a question that's been asked in the House in the manner in which he responded I think calls for your attention, Sir, because I don't believe that that is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the same point of order in the exact same fashion as the Honourable Member for Morris, I would like to indicate to you, Sir, that had the Attorney-General not dealt with the matter in the way he had it was my intention to rise on a matter of personal privilege, because yesterday I gave this House an explanation relative to the movement of and the method of locomotion relating to one Harvey Moats. That was given in this House very clearly, nevertheless it came out in a news broadcast as though no explanation had been given, and that in itself, Sir, constitutes I believe a matter of privilege. However, I like the Member for Morris am well aware that even though the remedy of privilege is always open to us one can never hope that it could be used to the fullest extent needed and so the matter can be allowed to rest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: On the point of order that the Premier's addressed the House. Mr. Speaker, the Member to whom the remark "scandalous" is attached by the Attorney-General is not in the Chamber, I'm not able to answer for him. Therefore the speech to the Chamber by the Attorney-General was quite out of order unless it was made on a point of privilege giving the member to whom the attack was addressed an equal opportunity of response. I want the record to show that the silence from Mr. Johnston is because he was not in the House at the time this unwarranted, and as the facts will ultimately show, unprovable charge was made.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Can he advise the House whether he is approving or developing the tax forms for the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education and Urban Affairs)(Burrows): Whether I am approving or developing at the present time? Yes, I am in the process of approving.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I asked the question a week ago, I assume that constitutes the answer. Can he also undertake to provide the Members of the Legislature with copies of the tax form that is to be provided to the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, every taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba or in the City of Winnipeg will receive one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Highways. I would like to ask the Minister what progress he is making with the Federal Government in respect to getting approval for a road through the Riding Mountain National Park to connect the communities of Rosssburn and Grandview.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that the road that the honourable member is talking about is a road that would go through the national park and of course we have no jurisdiction over our national parks, it's a federal problem.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GRAHAM: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I will ask again the Minister, what progress he is making in respect to consultation and requests to the Federal Government for that type of approval?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, once there is something to report on it, it will be reported in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the storm raised by the NDP . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would again appeal to the honourable member not to preface his questions with things which may create heat or which may be debatable. The question period is for placing questions directly. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: And I am attempting to do so in a manner that is inoffensive to you Sir, but I have watched other Speakers in the conduct of their affairs and very quickly they make it clear to honourable members that they cannot preface their questions. The Member for Wolseley does so with impunity, and every time. Now, Sir, this cannot be allowed to continue on with such obvious violation of practice of parliament. He does it all the time and it has to be stopped.

MR. MACKLING: It's not just . . . ignorance, it's studied ignorance, that's what it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Yes, on the point of order raised by the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, I also have observed gallery, rather Speaker conduct, House conduct in several Legislatures and Parliaments in this world, including the Mother Parliament in Britain and in Ottawa, and I take very strong issue with what the First Minister has said on his point of order. His point of order is quite in error inasmuch as this House has adopted a practice of certain latitudes in prefacing questions in response to the practice that developed in permitting the widest latitude in response. Well, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member is debating the issue. I have heard the point of order raised by the First Minister, I appreciate the points of view that members have, but let me cite Beauchesne Citation 172: "The Speaker, in common with his duties of supervision over the proceedings of the House may rule out questions which violates the privileges of parliament in the same way as he deals with irregularities in motions and amendments." This is from May's as well, and from Redlich. "He may make an alteration in the question or refer it back to the member for correction. A member may call attention to the House in respect to a matter and may challenge the action but he may not debate it." The honourable member may have a question if he wishes.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Could he indicate whether it is the practice or policy of his government to permit government aircraft to be used to fly backbench government members to their nominating conventions at public expense?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is not policy. On the other hand my honourable friend should know that within the Province of Manitoba on whatever occasion involving official business or public business, meetings with local residents, meetings with municipal and local government officials, that I have used the aircraft on many occasions, and I intend to continue to do so, Mr. Speaker.

I have given an undertaking that I will not use the aircraft whether on a pay back basis or whatever, I will not use it in any case that is a case of going on a vacation whether a weekend vacation or any kind of off duty type of purpose, nor will I take it out of the province except in the rare circumstance when an interprovincial meeting or conference might be involved. Those are the parameters, I'm quite willing to set them alongside the practice followed in other provinces and certainly alongside the practice that is followed by the utilization of Canadian Forces aircraft and aircraft owned by the Government of Canada.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Did the Government aircraft fly a member of the backbench of the New Democratic Party to his nominating convention last week at public expense?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SCHREYER: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I was in northern Manitoba last weekend and therefore I did utilize one of the MGAS aircraft but certainly there was no one, no private member on his way to a nominating convention was allowed to attend.

Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is interested, I will give him some examples of backbenchers of the Liberal caucus of Canada who have been utilizing Government aircraft. If he wishes I will give him names. I can also advise my honourable friend that the late Gordon Beard as a private member utilized the government aircraft from time to time. That was with our full knowledge and consent. And I believe that the same service is available to the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland, the Member for Thompson, those that have northern communities that they represent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just on this point, and again I'm speaking from memory, but I'm fairly certain that I'm right. That I was advised by the staff in charge of Manitoba Government Air Services soon after the New Democratic Party came to power that there was a practice that when aircraft was going to northern Manitoba and there were available seats, that MLAs from the area could go with those aircraft. He told me that this was available in the past and that it should be available to our members. I advised him, and again I'm going by recollection, to instruct the other parties that this was the policy, that if there was a plane going and they wanted to go it was available to them. I believe that that communication went out to the other parties.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may, as having been the last Minister responsible for the Manitoba Government Air Services of the previous administration. The statement just made by the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is essentially correct and a practice that was carried out by the previous administration. And one, Mr. Speaker, that we should not allow any cloud to be cast over. It is common sense, it is a recognition of the unique geography that our northern constituencies present to both the members and to the constituents who after all have a right to be seen by their members as often as possible. And while if there is occasions of outright abuse of these privileges, I think it should be very clearly understood that if seats are available an elected member of the House serving these northern constituencies, this has been the practice as far as I know during the full tenure of time that I was responsible for the Department and many years after.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Inasmuch as you have allowed statements by the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party I wish to add to what he said. That there is no quarrel on the part of the Liberal Party with a policy that is stated and understood. However, Mr. Speaker, at this very moment in other Legislatures, Ontario particularly, there is a very severe debate raging over this very kind of issue and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. We -- The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . spurious point of order raised by the Member for Wolseley. If there is a debate in Ontario raging -- and I'm not certain if there is, my honourable friend is sometimes given to overstatement -- it is probably because the aircraft in question in Ontario has been used not only on official business, it has been used on unofficial business by self - admission on vacation and holiday purposes and out of province, into some of the states in the union, for skiing and other vacation purposes. And Sir, there is a difference.

The Member for Lakeside has put it very well. There have been certain parameters, certain guidelines which have been adhered to. It is not an exhaustive and comprehensively stated list but certainly the practice here is fairly clear and has been for a number of years. My honourable friend insists on mixing apples with oranges. Utilization of aircraft out of the province for vacation purposes of the First Minister and his family is quite a different thing, and, Sir, we have not used it for that purpose.

A MEMBER: Your member is embarrassed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I believe we have ventilated that particular subject sufficiently. We are still in the question period not debating any issue.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I wish to direct to the Minister of Mines and Resources. I wonder if he would be able to tell me when he will be able to reply to the question that I placed on the Order Paper several weeks ago - in order to save the time of the question period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I assure my honourable friend that the question has been referred to the department and I will be getting an answer in due course. They read the question period every day and perhaps when they are reading what I am now saying it will spur them on a bit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs. Will additional grants be made to the City of Winnipeg such as were made last year, in addition to what's contained in the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, discussions are under way with the City of Winnipeg regarding the Budget for the forthcoming year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would instruct me as to whether it's in order to respond to a question of the Honourable Member for Brandon West that was raised during Estimates dealing with responsibility of the Minister of Finance? It's very brief and may be questioned about it but if I could.

MR. SPEAKER: Brief answers are allowed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon West asked during the Estimates of the Tourism Department whether the Minister of Finance would be tabling the report under the Lotteries Act, and I've just confirmed this morning that on July 5th, 1972, it's reported in the Journals, I did table the report of the Lotteries Commission as of March 31, 1972, which was the latest report. The present report, or the report for the year ending March 31, 73 is of course not yet ready and is not required to be tabled until June 30, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE; Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Will he then provide copies of that report that was tabled as of the year ending 1972. --(Interjection)-- No, it was tabled but copies were not distributed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I first indicate that the responsibility for the report is now in the hands of the Minister for Tourism, but I am again informed that the report I filed was filed, the correct report under the Act, on July 5; that subsequent to that a report in the usual printed form had been distributed amongst members, and if it hasn't been received I can only suggest to members that we have complied with the requirements of the Act, copies of the report I suppose would be obtainable through the Minister, through the Department of Tourism, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Member for Morris asked or wanted to know why the Veterinary Services Commission reversed its decision on the provision of service to the St. Claude area. The information I have, Sir, is that they simply confirmed their original position, that it was not a reversal of their position.

Members opposite also expressed an interest in knowing the composition of the Egg Marketing Agency for Canada and indeed the membership of the National Farm Products Marketing Council. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the membership of the agency is representative of all provinces in Canada and members of each provincial board are on that agency. The Marketing Council of course has a membership not from every province but a total membership of five. The Chairman being Paul Babey from Alberta, the Vice Chairman Real Roy, from Quebec; and then the membership from Ontario, New Brunswick, Manitoba

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. USKIW cont'd) and Prince Edward Island are represented by Ralph Ferguson, Adrien Levesque, Albert Vielfeure and Hector Hill. I might point out to members opposite that everyone here should know who Albert Vielfeure is, a very capable representative for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether -- I have a question of privilege, whether this is the time I should raise it, in response to the Minister's answer when he said that the Veterinary Services Commission simply confirmed the decision they made. I happened to be at a meeting with the Veterinary Services Commission with a delegation from St. Claude when it was made very clear to them that they were to be in receipt of a cash assistance plan which was provided for under The Veterinary Services Act, and there are witnesses to that decision. And I maintain, Sir, that the decision of the Veterinary Services Commission was a reversal of the position that they had stated to the delegation from St. Claude, and it was in that context that I asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister. Let me, before the Honourable Minister answers, indicate that it is irregular to supply information during the question period but since there was some doubt in my mind I had to allow it. Now that I have allowed it I must allow an answer, but I would prefer if it would be brief. The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am only going by a memo received from the Commission. Apparently there was a decision made and then a subsequent review of that decision and a third meeting which then confirmed the first position of the Commission, so that in the meantime there may have been consideration and some indication according to what the Member for Morris has suggested or in concert with that suggestion, but the final position is the original position. So that it's quite possible that we are both right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Number of new private industries established in Manitoba in 1972.
2. The names and locations of said industries.
3. The number of employees engaged by each new industry.
4. Initial private capital investment of new each industry; and
5. The number of failures of businesses in 1972 and the capital involved in each failure.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this Order is accepted subject of course to the availability of data from DBS and our own sources.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return - the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. (Stand?) Very well. The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 (a)(1) - I believe the Honourable Minister of Health has 25 minutes. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was sort of expecting the Minister would have carried on from where he left off last evening. He'd just started to reply. But there are two or three things that have caused some concern to me dealing with the general field of provision of health services to the people of Manitoba and the sort of arbitrary method that the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) government has used to implement what they consider to be proposed changes in their method of distribution of health services.

Mr. Chairman, as a former member of a hospital board, a man who was directly involved in the day to day operation of one of the facilities that provide for health care in the province, I know that I can voice the concern of other members who are in the similar field throughout the Province of Manitoba. These are mainly citizens of the province who are serving without pay, who are appointed to do a job and in the carrying out of those duties become vitally concerned with the methods of operation that are proposed by the government of the day. We have seen numerous proposals put forward from time to time by the Minister, by members of his staff; we've seen papers put forward advocating changes, and the number one concern I think expressed by most of the citizenry of the province who are placed in the position of having to administer in the health service field is the lack of consultation that has occurred in the past between government and those that are charged with the responsibility of administration.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is common practice for good administration to have continuous dialogue. I believe that both the government and those that are charged with the responsibility of administration have a common purpose, that is to provide the best possible health services for the people at a cost that is commensurate with the ability of the citizenry-at-large to pay for those services. So I would urge the Minister in all his future negotiations and proposals in the health field to continuously dialogue with those that are in the administration, whether they be at the lowest level or at intermediate levels, so that the proposals that are put forward by government are not misconstrued, so that the people are going to have ample opportunity to participate, to suggest and to discuss, so that both government and those who have the responsibility of administration are fully aware of the intentions of government and also government is fully aware of the concerns of the people that his programs are intended to help.

With those few words, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister again in all future negotiations to talk to the people, to make his proposals known and to sit down and discuss before arriving at any definite conclusions.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Before I recognize the next speaker I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 41 students of Grade 9 standing from the Arborg Collegiate under the direction of Messrs. Aitken and Sorowkowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George. On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly I bid you welcome.

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 (a)(1) -- the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to the comments made last evening by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I'm still awaiting some details on questions asked by different members of the House. I'll be answering some of the questions later on once we've had the research done.

I believe that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is somewhat receiving conflicting advice so far as the program, so far as social assistance is concerned as it regards the provincial assistance and the municipal assistance in regard to welfare. When you talk of abuse and when you talk about statistics you have to make a distinction between those cases that are at the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development in regards to the unemployed employables in local government districts and those that are the responsibility of municipalities, and that is pertaining to the unemployed employables. And that is probably one of the reasons why - maybe not the major reason - one of the reasons why the percentage of abuse, the percentage of cases that my honourable friend is making reference to is conflicting in as far as what I made known to the House in answers to questions and in my opening remarks.

As far as the question asked in regards to the research assistants within my department I will get the job description and make it known to my honourable friend. I attempted last evening in the few minutes that I had to at least make some precisions in regard to day care

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) facilities, to the day care program within the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development. I did indicate that we are still in negotiation with the Federal Government so far as cost sharing. The honourable member made reference to an amount within my Estimates that will be available for payment of per diem and an outright grant for the start-up of day care facilities. We will be discussing hopefully more of the details once we hit that item of the Estimates and hopefully that we can conclude the negotiations that we have, that we're undertaking now with the Federal Government. We discussed them at the last conference of Welfare Ministers and the only comment that the National Welfare Minister indicated was that whenever a province desires to enter into a universal program, of which the day care program is not, that the province in question would not suffer financial losses, So we were assured of that not only pertaining to the coverage of say nursing homes, hostels under a universal program, but this would equally be applicable say to a day care program. We got that decision following the conference.

The day care program that we are contemplating would be a day care program available to all based on the ability to pay but entering into a meaningful partnership with the different communities. So we're not pretending to pick up all of the cost pertaining to day care facilities. We're hoping to have this done on a shared basis not only with the Federal Government but with the interested groups, and it will be co-ordinated by the Department of Health and Social Development staff within the different regional offices that we have across the province. I will be bringing more precision pertaining to that program later on and hopefully during my Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Under which item would this sum of 500, 000 appear? Under Income Security, Mothers' Allowances or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: I haven't got my total Estimates before me. I'll search this out and give the reference to my honourable member later.

The honourable member was asking how does the surplus of the last fiscal year reflect on the Estimates of this year. Well if you subtract all new services within the Estimates of this year you will find that there is a large reduction of request of funds from this House as compared to last year.

The honourable member is aware that last year the request from the Department of Health and Social Development was approximately \$190 million from this House, and when you subtract the amount needed for the universal coverage of all levels of health care, which is about \$10 million, and when you take the work incentives, and when you take the Pharmacare coverage for senior citizens over 65, and when you take all the additional amounts that you have within the Estimates and for the same services as 1972-73 . . . what I came for, without additional services for 1973-74, I'd have been close to \$20 million less than last year and I can give details on that. So that's how the requests of this year reflect the surplus in part that we have in 1972-73 ending March 31, 1973.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Just while it's fresh in my mind, would he inform us, the health inspectors, are they still under his department or have they been transferred under the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management? And if so, what would be the total amount involved in the staff?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, the health inspectors have been transferred last year to the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. They are still at the disposal of requests by the Department of Health and Social Development and to my knowledge the arrangement is working tremendously well. I've had initially, when the transfer was made, some adverse reaction to the transfer but things seem to be working out quite well at this stage. So there's no amount within my Estimates to reflect that need. That would be within the Estimates of the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

I'll be making comments, Mr. Chairman, later on in regards to the question asked of the Member for Fort Rouge in regards to CPP - greater benefits for widows and for remaining spouse and so on.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia is not here so I'll withhold comments till he gets back, and the Honourable Member for Virden is not here either. I had some comments for him.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) I did make a few comments last evening in regard to the question posed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and he was making reference to some sort of a committee of the House that the Department of Health and Social Development, the Health Services Commission and its agencies, would actually come before. The honourable member is quite aware that the government appoints a Minister who is made responsible for the activities of the Department of Health and Social Development, and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and that the Minister can be questioned through this process but when a bill is brought in the House that related agencies or associations like the MMA, like the College of Physicians and Surgeons, when they do appear before committees of the House they can then be questioned as far as their opinions in regard to activities within the department, within the Health Services Commission, and more specifically in regard to the bill before the committee at that time. So that is a process I feel that is adequate. The government answers for the activities of this department through the Minister of Health and Social Development and the activities of the Health Services Commission.

MR. FROESE: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. FROESE: What committee is he referring to now that is able to call these people before them? I don't know of any committee that presently exists that can do this.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I was not making reference to a committee that can call individuals, I was making reference to committees of the House that certain groups, certain professions can appear and make their thoughts known and at that point members of the House either sitting on that committee, can ask these groups certain questions, can ask these groups their opinions and so on pertaining to activities within the Department of Health and Social Development and/or the Manitoba Health Services Commission. This is the process that I see.

Pertaining to the agencies that the Department of Health and Social Development financially support, questions can be asked during my Estimates pertaining to those agencies. Questions can be asked pertaining to Children's Aid Societies, as an example, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and related agencies that the AFM supports through a global grant that we make to the AFM and so on. So that is the process that is policy and has been for many years.

In regards to the cost increase per bed, per hospital bed in the Province of Manitoba, I'm hoping to be able to either table or make known to the House in answering questions later the increase in costs per hospital bed, say for the last few years, not only in Manitoba but in relation to other provinces in Canada, so I'll be bringing some information to the House either in written form or by answering questions.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland was asking where to find the capital expenditures for, say, hospitals as an example, within the capital expenditures presented to this House. The honourable member will not find that information within the capital expenditures tabled in the House, he'll find that in the details given by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. That's where you'll find the capital expenditures, say, for hospitals and so on. That is worked into the hospital budgets and reflected in those amounts. So if you're talking of the last fiscal year, you can look at the report that was tabled in this House a few weeks ago, I believe, or if you're talking of expenditures contemplated for 1973-74, questions can be asked on the amount of \$70 million -- approximately \$70 million asked by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

The honourable member had a lot of good comments to make last night and he asked questions pertaining to nursing staff and the adequacy of the two year course as compared to the three year course for nursing staff. I would sincerely recommend to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that that question be posed of the Minister of Colleges and Universities who is actually responsible for courses given within --(Interjection)-- I don't agree. The Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities, for the information of the Member for Lakeside, answers all questions to the best of his ability.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland was making reference to the reduction in some cases and the increase into welfare costs in the Province of Manitoba. We're not only predicting a decrease in welfare costs for those cases that are the responsibility of the Department

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) of Health and Social Development, but a healthy decrease in welfare assistance to those cases that are responsible to municipalities. And that is based on the reduction of assistance in 1972-73 in both cases, those cases responsible to municipalities and those responsible to the department, and on the buoyancy of the economy and the job creation by the different departments of government and by private enterprise, and we can foresee a good year pertaining to a reduction in costs for social assistance.

If I may go back somewhat to the question posed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and that was pertaining to the unemployed employables, the Member for Fort Rouge asked whether all so-called unemployed employables are guilty of abuse of welfare. And I hope I'm not misquoting the honourable member but that was the gist of the comment that I took anyway in note. I am somewhat surprised that the opposition. . .

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . that this was the most visible group to the people who tend to be critical of welfare abuse.

MR. TOUPIN: So I did get it right. I really am surprised, though, that the opposition's expert on welfare could ask such a question in a sense, but I'll attempt to give some answer. If a 60 year old woman, as an example, becomes a widow and has no support and therefore has to fall back on municipal welfare - and what happens quite often - is that what the Member for Fort Rouge calls abuse? Maybe the honourable member could comment later. Abuse, Mr. Chairman, is when someone is on welfare who could be working, someone who has a job available. When there is four or five percent unemployment, the fact that someone is employable does not automatically mean that there is employment available to them. The facts still are that in this country there are no jobs available for all who can work. Perhaps the Member for Fort Rouge sees this as the fault of the employment, or the unemployment in the case of those, say, that become available to the working force after being away from it for so many years. Like the example of the woman, say, of 60 years old who has lost her last child - 18 years old - and she becomes employable. I think the blame for the unemployment may be placed a little closer to the Federal Government's past and present practice pertaining to job placement and job opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to explain an apparent difference between my account of the number of unemployed employables and the Premier's. I don't often do this but I feel that I must attempt to clarify what was meant to be the same explanation to this House. Anyone who has looked at our Social Allowance Act should now know that provincial welfare is available only to certain categories of persons as stated in Section 5 of the Act. Provincial allowances are available only to persons who are physically and mentally incapable of supporting themselves for extended periods, to widows and mothers with dependent children and so on. The only unemployed employables receiving welfare directly from the province are those in unorganized territories, the LGDs, where the province takes on what are usually municipal functions, and as of the end of March 1973 there were 452 cases of this sort. This may be compared to 866 cases as of December 31, 1972 and 1,566 as of December 1971. This, Mr. Chairman, was the number I was referring to. I hope the honourable member took note of these figures.

Now in addition to provincial welfare, the municipalities are also responsible for welfare. Persons who are not eligible for provincial welfare are referred to municipal welfare for support. A municipal welfare case might, for example, be a person who becomes unemployed because of the same temporary injury such as a broken leg, and all these cases can be broadly spoken of as employables although this does not mean that there is always employment available to them. It means that they are normally capable of working if there's work for them to do. The Premier was discussing the total number of such persons receiving welfare at that time, that is the total of all municipal type cases. As of February 1973 there were 5,543 cases of this sort. This may be compared to 7,338 cases as of February 1972 and 7,730 as of February 1971. So let's not attempt to compare apples and oranges; we're talking of two different things. These are not people who are abusing welfare. --(Interjection)-- Pears and bananas? Okay, I agree. These are not people who are taking advantage of an overly generous society. I would say quite the reverse is true. These are the people who suffer most from our rapidly changing economy from the resulting inflation and unemployment. I would go on to say that these person represent a tremendous waste of potential wealth for all

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) of society. That is why it is our intention to see that these persons all have socially useful work to do. That is why we have undertaken to try and provide a job for all Manitobans who want and need one.

Now I would not like to disappoint the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge by denying that there is any welfare abuse at all. She knows the contrary. She has access to files sometimes that I haven't even seen. There is some abuse of all the system in our society, from self-serve stores to taxes. Did the honourable member get that? There is some abuse of all the system in our society, from self-serve stores to taxes. Now I believe that there is comparatively little abuse of welfare if you compare both. The current figures on abuse for the fiscal year 1972-73 are: 153 investigations, 73 of which have gone through the courts resulting in 20 convictions; 80 cases are still being investigated by our department. I would like to remind the House that this is after an intensive audit of all the 27,000 cases on our rolls throughout the seven regions in the Province of Manitoba. To give the reference to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on regards to the amount within the Estimates for day care, this amount is provided for under Resolution No. 58 and is included under Financial Assistance to External Programs.

Mr. Chairman, I will now -- oh yes, I would like to deal briefly, if I have time, with the comments made by the Member for Birtle-Russell. The honourable member was making reference to changes, contemplated changes and so on in the health field and related social services, I believe - I don't know if he said that but it is encompassed under the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development and the lack, according to his reaction, the lack of consultation with those interested groups and the individuals within those groups in so far as the administration and the delivery of service either in Health or Welfare. I have to agree with the honourable member that I, often as a Minister, or even some of my civil servants do not take enough time to consult with individuals, say private agencies or related groups that render services similar to what is being offered directly by government through the Department of Health and Social Development and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. We do consult as best we can, and I think the best example of this is showing at least some government intent or some position of government for a real discussion with all groups in society that are interested in the delivery of health care and related social services. And here I would like to make only two references to show the sincerity of government in entering into a meaningful dialogue with all groups of society including professions, but mainly consumers of services. I think that has to be, our utmost desire is to get the feeling of the grass roots that are receiving the services intended to be offered by the Department of Health and Social Development, the Health Services Commission and all agencies involved in the delivery of service. The White Paper on Health gives a real sincere desire . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has five minutes.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . gives a real sincere desire of government to dialogue with the people of Manitoba to show them what is now happening, what we can foresee the future as being and intended by ourselves, but yet not showing a definite position of government pertaining to these services to be offered, and wanting their reaction, wanting their proposals. So that is an example of the sincere desire to dialogue and receive advice from those interested groups.

The other paper that has been presented by myself some time ago, on which we're receiving comments constantly by individuals and groups in the Province of Manitoba, is the White Paper on Corrections, The Rise of the Sparrow, which is really getting feedback from all types of individuals in the Province of Manitoba, good and bad. And we're weighing both. But these are just a few examples of what can be accomplished by, you know, showing at least what there is possible, what we have -- I think we have to start by a base - what we now have as services, what is contemplated as change, and then receive reaction.

SUPPLY -HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman with respect to the standing appropriations for this particular department, I'd like to say to the Minister that our main concern beyond the area of welfare programs and social assistance, lies in the relationship between the government and the medical profession in this province. It lies in the attitude of this government towards the medical profession and the sense of alienation that many members, the majority of members in the medical profession feel because of the government's attitude. Sir, this has to be a primary concern to Manitobans. When their medical practitioners, when their doctors are disenchanting, when there is seething discontent, and it can be described literally as "seething discontent", across the entire spectrum of the medical profession and the doctor fraternity, Manitobans have to be concerned. And if this is a people's government - and it has always styled itself as one but in the minds of many of us on this side of the Chamber there is substantial doubt as to their justification for that claim - if this is a people's government, then surely it's reasonable to ask why is the government so insensitive to a problem that has to be of major concern to all Manitoba people.

The average age of general practitioners in Manitoba today is approximately 55, Mr. Chairman. The general practitioner is becoming older and older chronologically, and in fact is perhaps in some danger of disappearing from our social and medical scene to a very great degree; or perhaps I should put it the other way and say that we're in danger of finding him becoming a vanishing or an extinct species. It certainly is an endangered species; it's endangered largely because of the attitudes of this government. I'm not suggesting that the entire cause of the rising median age of the general practitioner can be attributed to the hostility expressed towards the medical profession and manifested in many ways by this government, but certainly it's part of the reason. It's not the entire reason; it wouldn't be fair to say that. Certainly part of the reason lies in the fact that young men and women going into medicine now specialize to a far greater degree than they ever did before, and so it stands to reason that there are going to be fewer people practicing generally and the median age is rising as a partial consequence of that. But it's also rising as a consequence of the fact that there is very little incentive now for young men and women coming into the medical field and coming out of our medical schools, who want to be general practitioners, to stay here and practice in the Province of Manitoba.

Statistically, there has been a relatively minimal decline in the number of practicing doctors in Manitoba over the past ten years although there has been a decline, but it has not been of a major numerical amount, but what is significant and what is real about it is that Manitobans, Manitoba-trained medical students, are going into practice in this province in far fewer numbers than ever before and that the openings, the slots that are coming up with greater rapidity in the medical field and in the medical profession, are being filled by graduates from other parts of the world. There is nothing wrong with that practice or that procedure in essence, but there is something wrong when one looks at it from the point of view of the Manitoba taxpayer, and the relationship between patients and their doctors, and the relationship between Manitobans and their fellow Manitobans in this provincial society.

I think it can be asked seriously of this government as to whether it is to the advantage of our taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, for a substantial number of the cream of our graduating medical students to leave this province and seek opportunities elsewhere even though replacements for them in the field of medicine are apparently available from immigration streams. I think the desirable thing is to have a reasonable mix in that community, to have the best of the immigration stream that is available to us and to have the best of our native trained, native raised and trained medical graduates staying here to practice. That isn't what's happening. The percentage of the Manitoban students is going down and the percentage and the immigrant ratio is going up, so that we are losing the opportunity to have the kind of mix that would be desirable and we are losing the advantages of our taxation revenues, taxation payments that have gone to educate those students of our own.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that the general practitioners' median age in the province now is around 55 does reflect seriously back on the attitudes of this government, although it can't be laid entirely at this government's doorstep. But it has to be a concern for government when that's taking place, and what has to be of even greater concern for government surely is the kind of alienation now expressed actively and openly by the Manitoba Medical

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . . Association where the good faith of this government is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not an increase in fees, an increase in schedules for the doctors of Manitoba is justified, is not the question at the moment. What is the question is the requirement for meaningful communication, for team work participation between government and medical people in this province to give Manitobans the best medical services that their tax money can buy. And that is not happening at this time. Regardless of what this government can say about the income position of doctors, regardless of the things that may happen in other parts of Canada that seem to be used by members on the government benches as arguments to support their position that doctors are overpaid, regardless of all those aspects of the general argument.

Mr. Chairman, the overweening fact of the matter is that there has been no meaningful discussion between doctors and government on the subject of fee schedules, on the subject of a new negotiated salary contract for doctors, and that's what's at the root of the problem. If this government can demonstrate that it has negotiated in good faith and attempted to do so in an open, communicative manner and come to the conclusion, supported by facts and evidence that any reasonable man or woman would be willing to look at and accept, that doctors are overpaid and that they're not justified in seeking a fee increase, then we have no argument with them. But, Mr. Chairman, they haven't done that, and for the Minister of Health to try to say that they have and for the First Minister to try to say that they have is sham, and it's a case of creating an incorrect impression that is calculated to lure Manitobans generally into a false sense of security where their medical profession and their health services are concerned.

The fact of the matter is that the sense of security and well-being that Manitobans have always enjoyed vis-a-vis doctors, health and health services is in danger. It's under threat because of the doctors' unhappiness. The morale of the doctors has been placed in jeopardy, and thus through that action, Mr. Chairman, the sense of security that we Manitobans have always enjoyed with respect to our doctors and our health services is placed in equal jeopardy. The doctor-patient relationship is in jeopardy, and not just the element of the right of the patient to choose his doctor, not just the element of freedom of choice which we hold dear, but the entire environment of the relationship between the doctor and the patient is in jeopardy because of the doctors' sense of alienation, because of the doctors' dissatisfaction with the way they have been treated or perhaps it would be more correct to say "haven't been treated" by this government. If a doctor feels that he is being treated unfairly, mistreated, ignored, alienated, shut out by this government, who suffers, Mr. Chairman? It's the patient; it's the Manitoban; it's the individual among us who suffers. It's the Manitoban who has always enjoyed that close, constructive, healthy doctor-patient relationship, who pays the price when the doctor is unhappy. And our concern lies there, Mr. Chairman. Our concern lies with the individual who has always enjoyed the excellent rewards of that kind of an excellent system, and whose sense of well-being and security with his doctor now is in danger because of his doctor's discontent.

It's not as though, Mr. Chairman, this is something that came up out of the blue and on which the Minister had no warning. We have spoken repeatedly inside this Chamber in particular and, to a substantial degree, outside this Chamber of the collision course that this government and the medical profession in this province have been on almost since the day this government was elected. And the present situation, which is now one of serious confrontation, is a result directly of the collision course that for some reason or other, either deliberately or through ignorance, this government constructed at the start of the lifetime of its present administration. There has been an attitude manifested by this government since Day One, of suspicion and mistrust of the medical profession, and it has led to the collision course to which we've referred, which in turn now has led to collision.

One hesitates to say too much on that particular subject at this precise moment, Mr. Chairman, because we hope that consultations and communications with the doctors on a fee schedule revision are really going to be taking place within the next few days and are really going to be meaningful. We hope that this time it's going to be for real, so I recognize that I take some responsibility at this juncture for perhaps re-stirring up a hornet's nest and I want to be careful not to make the issue any hotter or any more inflamed than it already is. I'm hopeful that the state of cold war that's existed between the two sides has been dissipated and

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . that there are going to be meaningful communications in the days immediately ahead. So I don't want to accuse the government too strenuously or for too long today about not listening and not talking in good faith because it may remind them of the tactics that they've employed in the last three years and they may decide to continue on the course that they close earlier and we may be back into the same kind of run-around in the days immediately ahead, the same kind of maze that we've been trapped in on this subject for months and years. I'm hopeful that this time there's going to be something done that will lead to a solution to the problem. And the only solution in which we are concerned, and the only solution in which Manitobans are concerned, and the only one with which this government should have any concern is a solution that enables the medical profession to feel content in its position in society and therefore serve Manitobans with the excellence that they have displayed generally, generally, in the past.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, there have exercises in communication on the subject of a new doctor's fee schedule and many many generalized and intricate reference have been made to these consultations by the Minister of Health and by the First Minister. But, Sir, that's been tokenism. What's taken place up to this time has been sheer tokenism and window-dressing. It's been made to look as though this government is concerned about the discontent in the medical profession but there's been nothing real done. A few a few meeting have taken place with the MHSC negotiator, a few communications have been exchanged, a few bland government statements have been issued and a hundred meaningless answers, a hundred evasions have been delivered in this House by members of the government benches when we have tried to seek information as to what is being constructively achieved and what real negotiations are taking place.

When we raised the warning a few weeks and a few months ago, Mr. Chairman, that there was going to be a hardening of positions, that there was going to be a crystalizing of these counter-positions we got a hurt look in essence from the government and a stout denial that the government had any blame or held any responsibility in this kind of situation. Who us? the government asked in effect. Who me? the Minister of Health asked in effect; me being un-communicative; me not dealing and consulting constructively and in good faith with the Medical profession? Why that's, that's a terrible thing to say. You wound me deeply to say that. You hurt us deeply when you accuse us, the great people's government, of not sitting down and dealing in good faith with the medical profession. Well, Mr. Speaker, they may have been wounded in their eyes; they'll be far more seriously wounded if they persist in the kind of attitude that has led to the confrontation state that now exists. And no one can deny that such a state exists because the proof and the evidence lies in the events of the past 10 to 12 to 14 days. It was all right I suppose for a while for the Minister of Health to stand up and say that everything was going along swimmingly and that we were negotiating with the doctors and the whole problem was going to be worked out and there were continuing consultations and there was continuing discussion. Well that turned out to be a pack of rubbish, Mr. Chairman, as is evidenced by the position that was taken publicly by the Manitoba Medical Association through its President, its retiring President, Dr. Peter Connelly, 10 to 12 days ago. Why would there have been that kind of a statement made and public position taken by the Medical Association which was tantamount to a suggestion that organization might have to take place. We've -- (Interjection)--

MR. TOUPIN: Could the honourable member tell me who cancelled the last meeting between the MMA and myself?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the MMA cancelled that last meeting, but that hardly, that hardly deflates the argument that the MMA has pushed and which I defend to the effect that the government has not negotiated in good faith, because the cancellation, that cancellation was predicated on other factors, was not based on the fact that the MMA didn't want to sit down and talk with the Minister in particular but it was based on the fact that the MMA has always wanted to deal with the Minister and with the First Minister in an eyeball to eyeball kind of situation at the top, at the top, and not be foisted off in negotiating sessions at an intermediary level which really don't produce the kind of environment for solution that they desire. It's purely in that context that some of those meetings have been rejected by the MMA. From the beginning the MMA has wanted to deal with the Minister and

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . . the First Minister and not deal through intermediate channels.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, at that point in time the MMA had reached the position where they were almost propelled, almost catapulted by the attitudes of their own members into taking some pretty dramatic action. At that point in time the discontent in the profession, in the general membership had reached the point where, as is often the case in labour negotiations, as is often the case with union leadership, where their membership demands some kind of tangible concrete action, and if it requires action bordering on the dramatic then it requires action bordering on the dramatic. This is what happened and any kind of a meeting with the Minister at that point in time was a meeting that was coming too late. The forces that have been building up, the forces that had been building up finally had to be recognized and they made themselves known through that public statement and press conference that the MMA President, now retiring President, issued a few days ago. So this really defuncts the whole argument of the Minister's and the First Minister's that negotiations of a meaningful nature have always been going on

I asked in the House two days ago I think, Mr. Chairman, Wednesday, whether the government now accepted the request to the MMA for a new contract. The Minister gave me another one of his now familiar evasive answers which shed no light on the subject at all and which said in effect that everything is as it has always been, it's healthy, it's communicative, negotiations are an on-going thing; there's been nothing accepted but there's been nothing rejected. Well that doesn't sum up the situation anywhere near accurately, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is that there have as, I have said, been no meaningful negotiations and in the last few weeks between the statement issued by the MMA and the reply, the letter that went out at approximately the same time from the Premier, the situation had been brought to a point where the stage was now set for something very tangible and very concrete, and that's quite different from what had been happening. At least this is the MMA's impression. They believe that the letter, I think dated April 24th, I'm not sure of that date, Mr. Chairman, but the letter that the Premier sent to the MMA at the same time as the MMA made its presidential statement. They believe that that letter represents an acceptance by this government of the doctors' request for a new fee contract, for a new schedule.

Now the Minister may not be aware of that because the doctors may not have made that known to him, but I'm telling him that this is the understanding that the MMA has. That that letter in effect represents an acceptance of their request for a new rate schedule and therefore that meaningful bargaining was now going to take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well when I asked the Minister and the First — no I asked the Minister not the First Minister. When I asked the Minister about this on Wednesday he gave no such indication that he had any kind of understanding that that was the condition of the situation now. He didn't indicate to me, I didn't gather from his remarks that he thought there's been one iota of change. As I said a moment ago, I got the kind of answer from him that we've been getting for six months on this subject. So one has to ask in all seriousness whether there are now going to be real and meaningful negotiations, whether this time it's for real.

So Mr. Chairman, there are many individual aspects of this question that I think should be looked at and I would like to examine further on in the Estimates and probably the place to do them would be under the item dealing with the Manitoba Health Services Commission itself, but I wanted to at this point in the consideration of these Estimates make this general case because I know that my colleagues and Manitobans generally want to hear what the Minister has to say about the climate existing between government and the doctors. I say in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks are in no way an exaggeration of the attitude of the doctors themselves. They're in no way an exaggeration of the discontent in the medical profession. This government says, well you know we're eliminating the Medicare premium so we don't really have to care about what a few doctors may think. We're going to have the people with us because we're eliminating the Medicare premium. Well that's fine as long as they don't eliminate the medical profession along with the Medicare premium. And if they don't eliminate the medical profession they're going to eliminate the most important ingredient, one of the most important elements in that profession in Manitoba, and that is the doctor-patient relationship because they're moving in the direction of a collectivist state-oriented,

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . state-operated medical profession which will find none of our local medical school graduates staying here in the future. And all we'll be getting to serve us in the medical profession in the future if this continues is people who, is people who come to Canada for a possibly higher material standard of living but without the foreknowledge that they may be coming into a system that they just left, as my colleague the Member for Lakeside points out. They may be coming into a system that really represents no improvement; notwithstanding the higher material standards, the ability and the freedom to operate on their own initiative, to work and fulfill themselves according to their own individual dictates will not be available to them.

So the elimination of the Medicare premium is not necessarily the kind of panacea that perhaps some members of the government believe it is, Mr. Chairman. The people of Manitoba profit none, profit none at all by elimination of Medicare premiums or totally free medical service if this government continues to fight with its doctors and with its medical practitioners. There's no profit in that equation for the people of Manitoba. That's the part of the mathematics that this government has to face up to, and to go through the window-dressing routines of the last six months and then have the medical profession, through the Association, make the public statement it did 10 or 12 days ago just underscores the essential warning that we've been trying to sound to this Minister and to this government for many months and many years now. If the government fails to go into a real bargaining session now, that has meaning to it, that has purpose to it, that has communication to it and that has government food faith built into it, then the kind of thing suggested by the MMA a few days ago is going to present itself in reality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I . . .

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

MR. TURNBULL: Is it not customary practice in the Chamber, Sir, to alternate between the Opposition side and the Government side?

A MEMBER: No, No.

MR. WATT: It's not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The chairman made his ruling. The Member for Arthur

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like . . .

MR. TURNBULL: . . . have a ruling on the point that I did raise? If it is not customary I would like you to indicate to me that it's not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just don't know the Citation but the Speaker, or Deputy Speaker, or Chairman of the Committee does not keep a list. I'll look up the pertinent . . . The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. TURNBULL: On the same point of order. Are you saying then, Sir, that it is not a custom of this Legislature during debate, either in Committee of the Whole or in the regular Session of the House to call upon speaker, for the Chair to recognize speakers from one side of the House and then the other side of the House? If that is not the custom, Sir, I would like you to say that it is not the custom because it certainly is my understanding, both from observation of the Speaker when he's in the Chair and from discussions with the Speaker that that in fact is the custom.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order, it's just a question of who the Chair's recognized. The Chair's recognized the Member for Arthur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, There is no point of order before the House. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to make a few comments on the Minister's salary. First I would like to say that I think that there are a great many people in the Province of Manitoba who will welcome the announcement that he made yesterday concerning the day-to-day costs or charges for those going into Nursing Homes. I believe he gave us the figure of a basic \$4.50 per day for people over 65 years of age and I think that a lot of people in that age group will welcome this announcement; it will be of great assistance to a considerable number of people in that age group. I refer also in the same area to the elimination of

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. WATT cont'd). . . . the medical premiums, that there are a great many people in the Province of Manitoba who will welcome the elimination of medical premiums.

But I just want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that contrary to the government's policy of helping those that are in need, apparently it's not a case of simply those people that are in need, it's blanket policies right across the board that tend to be completely at variance with their announced policy of helping those at the poverty level, if there are any people in this province who really are at the poverty level. I question that statement, a term that is constantly used here because I don't believe that there are people in this province that really are at the poverty level.

But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this type of policy actually across-the-board is nothing new really. I think the first legislation that ever came into the Province of Manitoba, that I recall anyway, goes back to the early Forties when the Prime Minister of Canada, Premier St. Laurent, brought in legislation which provide for old age pensions, as they were referred to at that time, and I believe at that time it was about \$20.00 per month across the board. --(Interjection)-- Old age pensions in 1942 - I think '42 was about the time, but it was the time that St. Laurent was the Prime Minister of Canada and some members in this House will recall seeing the Prime Minister --(Interjection)-- I think it's St. Laurent.

A MEMBER: No. Mackenzie-King.

MR. WATT: Well I won't argue with my honourable friend but I still say it was St. Laurent because I recall front page pictures of the major newspapers right across the board showing the Prime Minister of Canada receiving his first \$20.00 cheque. And at that time I think it was considered to be justified because of the fact that at that time most of the people in that age group were people with pride and with self-determination, that is somewhat lacking now that did exist at that time. That legislation was provided because there were people who were too proud, who did need the pension and who were too proud to ask for it, and so I don't think there was anyone in Canada at that time that really objected to the principle of pensions right across the board.

But the picture has changed, Mr. Chairman, and it has got to the point now where you can be perfectly justified and you can walk with your head up and with pride, on welfare whether you need it or not. And I say, Mr. Chairman, and this has largely been brought about because of the fact that the rural municipalities have been relieved of their responsibility in screening of our welfare cases throughout the province. They have practically been relieved of the screening.

There are many welfare people within the Province of Manitoba right now that the municipal councils are not aware of. There are some where the municipalities are still involved but who -- by and large welfare screening and administration has been centralized in the western area from the offices in Brandon, that is true, and I have had very many complaints from many people that are welfare cases now in the small towns and communities, which did not really exist some years back, that exist now, that the rural municipalities are not aware of, that it has been centralized and taken over by the government. They are the ones that really believe that they know who should get welfare and who should not throughout the rural areas, and I suggest that that responsibility should be put back in the hands of the local municipalities, people who are elected by the people, who represent probably 500 to 1,000 people and know, know their community and know their people, know who should be getting welfare and who should not.

I recognize that there are many people who need welfare, or need assistance for reasons that cannot be attributed to their own fault; there are circumstances that are not their fault that cannot be avoided, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are many people in the Province of Manitoba receiving welfare who should be and could be working if this province were providing the labour opportunities that they were committed to provide when they took office.

I was rather surprised to find yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in riding with a taxi driver, when he pointed out to me that the Unicity Taxi set-up now actually were answering calls for approximately 300 taxi trips in one day - welfare cases. Now generally, Mr. Speaker, when I have any distance to go in the city and I haven't got my car in here, I ride on the bus for two bits, but apparently the welfare people can afford to ride in taxis.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. WATT cont'd)

I want to speak for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, on the proposal of the government to centralize the administration of our medical and hospital service, and also on the proposal of the government to set up doctor clinics throughout the province. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when the responsibility to administer our local hospitals has been removed, has been centralized, or large areas have been set up and the administration has been centralized, where doctor clinics have been set up and apparently will be (we're not sure whether it's going to be done before the election or not; it won't be after the election because that government will not be there after the next election). But I would like to know if it is their intention to go forward with the centralization of the administration of medical care throughout the province, a government that is committed to decentralize, at least they say their intention is to decentralize, and at the same time the Minister of Health and the government are announcing their intentions to centralize medical service.

The Minister is aware that groups now are becoming so concerned that they drive all the way to Winnipeg to try to meet with the Minister and try to point out to him the need to maintain authority in our local communities in order to maintain and keep those local centres established and viable. He's aware, as I recall to him and to the House, that the hospital board from my own home town were here not too long ago and very concerned about the fact that they, as a board, had been operating and administering the services through the hospital in Reston for the past 20 years and under the proposed program they would lose that right and authority. I was rather surprised when I attended the meeting with the board and Mr. Hans Schneider, when Mr. Schneider pointed out to him that he couldn't understand their concern, that no policy had been established, and when the secretary of that board offered to open up his briefcase and show him a letter instructing them that their authority actually would terminate on a certain date insofar as renovation or addition or further services to be provided within that hospital, he was surprised that they should be concerned and yet he did not seem to be interested in having the secretary open up his briefcase and looking over in writing what had been sent out to them.

Further, the hospital board at Virden, the administration of the nursing care home there, the administration board of the hostel type senior citizens home, met in Virden some time ago and I spoke with some of them. The reason that they met was their concern because of the fact of the pending legislation, or regulation if you will, or simply the proposals, the intention of the government to proceed to centralize the whole issue under one authority.

Now there is concern, Mr. Chairman, in this respect and I think justifiably so, for a government that is committed to decentralize, that have made that commitment to the rural people in the Province of Manitoba to decentralize, that they are in effect going ahead centralizing to the detriment of our rural areas. And I want to draw this to the attention of the Minister, that the concern does not only lie in the area that I represent that I am speaking for now, but it does lie within the whole province of Manitoba, particularly when a government has made a commitment to invigorate, if you will, to inject local incentive into our rural communities in order that they may service, when at the same time in actual act and fact they are in the process of decentralizing throughout rural Manitoba.

I think that that is about all that I have to say at this moment. I will be making some comments further on the Minister's Estimates but I would like him to give some comments on the concerns that I have expressed here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I have the pertinent section here dealing with recognition of speakers and I'd like to read it out for the members' information. Citation 121, 1 and 2 of Beauchesne, and it reads as follows: "There should not be a list of speakers with an order of precedence in the House of Commons. Any member who wishes to speak may rise and endeavour to catch the Speaker's eye. He who is first seen has the right to speak. By old parliamentary usage, a member who wishes to make his maiden speech enjoys the privilege of being first seen by the Speaker, if he rises at the same time as other members. But the privilege will not be conceded unless claimed within the parliament to which the member was first returned."

Citation 121 (2) reads as follows: "The question of speakers is left entirely to the Speaker. If his call is disputed by some member who thinks he rose before the Speaker's choice, a motion may be made under Standing Order 35 that he be now heard. In calling upon

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd). . . . members to speak, it is customary for the Speaker to try and arrange for speakers pro and con alternatively. When, as often happens, the debate reaches its climax in a duel of speeches between the two Party chiefs, the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition if possible are called in immediate succession." So, the Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to lay a few facts on the table. Could I ask the government - not the government but the Opposition Whip to attempt to get the Member for Fort Garry and I'll deal with the Member for Arthur who is sitting in his seat.

I would like to clarify a point that maybe he misunderstood in my remarks previously, is that when we talk of a policy to ensure all levels of care to a certain degree and meeting certain standards and regulations, we're not only talking of ensuring, say, nursing homes as an example only for those 65 and over, we're talking about ensuring all levels of care for everyone in the Province of Manitoba, and here I'd like to cite him an example.

Back in 1948 I broke two arms while I was doing some trapeze and what not. I was placed into an acute care bed for 40 days. I didn't have to be in an acute care bed, I could have been, say, in a nursing home bed, in a hostel bed, or even at home. All I needed was someone to feed me. I was up in pulleys for 40 days. So when we say that we will be ensuring all levels of care, that means all levels of care for everyone in the Province of Manitoba after a certain amount. So that the individual himself will have the incentive and, most important, the doctor in question will have a real discretion to place the patient in the level of care that's needed for him. And in a lot of cases we've been told, and I think justifiably, that this was not possible because if an individual was placed into a personal care home or a hostel facility, that cost was his own responsibility, which we felt was unfair, apart from board and room.

So that is the policy and I did say yesterday and I say again, that this is unique in North America, unique in North America, unique in North America. Other governments in Canada have talked about it, some of them have implemented a part measure to ensure nursing home beds, say, like Alberta, Ontario, but none have gone as far as ensuring all levels of care and doubling the amount for home care services. Because we're saying that if we're going to ensure all levels of institutional care, that we should actually see that home care services be offered in the rural areas in the north, like it is in Greater Winnipeg, so that the patient that can't be cared for at home should be, and that there should be some coverage there. So that's the reason why we went even further in all institutional care, we put an additional million dollars into the coverage of home care services for the rural area in the north. And that's something we've never seen in your administration, my honourable members. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Question?

MR. WATT: I just want to point out that I think the Minister has misunderstood what I said. I'm not in disagreement with the policy of bringing the nursing care in under hospital services care. I'm talking simply about the - I gave you an example, for instance, of the Virden Nursing Home where . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member going to ask a question or is he going to make a speech because if he's going to make a speech --and I don't think the floor was yielded to him on last . . .

MR. WATT: I'll try to put it in the form of a question then. Does the Minister really believe that in the case of the Virden Nursing Home which now is full and has a waiting list, I believe there are 70 beds in that nursing home, 50 percent of those are on welfare, if you want to put it that way. The government is picking up the tab for the costs; the other 50 percent are paying their own shot and are perfectly capable of paying their own shot, but now, regardless of whether they can or whether they can't, if they are over a certain age the government will pick up the tab over four dollars and a half. That was my understanding of his announcement.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understood the honourable member right. He was actually -- he took the policy as being applicable only to those 65 and over, and the policy is not only applicable to those 65 and over when it pertains to the coverage of other levels of care, it pertains to every citizen in the Province of Manitoba. My example that I gave pertaining to myself in 1948 would be applicable today - well, that is after the 1st of July - if I'm placed in that level of care that's needed for me. So that is the major difference in

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . your understanding and what the government policy is.

The Honourable Member for Arthur really surprised me, and I would hope that he'd clarify if I'm misquoting him, when he said that no people in Manitoba are at a poverty level. I just can't believe my ears, you know. I couldn't believe my ears when I heard him say that. You know, why would we have, why would we be spending millions of dollars every year at this level of government, leaving aside what's being spent by the Federal Government, leaving aside what's being spent by the municipal governments, for welfare, for supplementing the working poor, for creating worthwhile work activities, if there were no poor people in Manitoba? Even though we have the lowest unemployment in Canada doesn't mean that we haven't got people at the poverty line. We have thousands of them.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I did not say there were no poor people in Manitoba. I said there were no people who were poverty-stricken in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. That is not a point of privilege, is a difference of opinion between two honourable members on the floor.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, let it be said and let it be recorded that I totally disagree with the Honourable Member for Arthur. (Applause)

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, let it be said, I totally disagree with the Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. There seems to be a very bad habit that's developing in this House of members jumping up, making intermediate statements that are not being recognized by the Chair. Now I'm going to instruct the recorder that until I recognize someone your mikes are going to be turned off. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there's another comment made by the Honourable Member for Arthur that's totally out of line and I have to refute without hesitation. That's the comment that he made pertaining to municipalities having been taken away their right to administer welfare. That's totally ridiculous. If municipalities today are not responsible for the unemployed employables they're breaking the law. Is that clear? As of the first of January, 1973, all municipalities in the Province of Manitoba are responsible for the unemployed employables. That's clear. If they're not doing that they're breaking the law and they should be prosecuted.

The only time that the Department of Health and Social Development will administer the paying out of welfare for the unemployed employables is in local government districts. Anywhere else in the Province of Manitoba where you have a municipal authority the responsibility for the unemployed employables lies with them. And they so decide what amount they will pay to the unemployed employables. We have not set standards for them. So I want that to be very clear.

During my Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I will point out to the Honourable Member for Arthur that when we say that we want to decentralize the administration of the Department of Health and Social Development we mean just that. And when we say that we are open to discussion and the arriving at consensus between different boards in different regions in Manitoba and districts we mean just that equally. That if you have a hospital board, if you have a nursing home board, if you have a hostel board that want to get together in a region, in a given district, in a given town that's up to them to decide. We're not forcing them to do that. And when we say that we take civil servants from Greater Winnipeg, if they're administering services in the Interlake that we want those individual civil servants to be offering those services right there in that region. We mean decentralization.

I can't understand and I hope my Deputy Minister will enlighten me, I can't understand my Deputy Minister not allowing a secretary of a municipality or a secretary of a board to open his briefcase to give him information. I've had, what is it now? Three Deputy Ministers and I believe him to be the most capable Deputy Minister in government, He's open-minded, he would have loved to have this information. I can't understand that. I'll have to speak to him after the adjournment of the House. There must have been, you know, information in there that he already had but I can't see Mr. Schneider refusing information. The Member for Arthur said that my Deputy Minister didn't even bother to have the secretary open his satchel or his briefcase to give him information. Well I don't know, there's something wrong.

Mr. Chairman, let me go to the Member for Fort Garry. He made some false

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . statements and I think it has to be said, it has to be put on the record what his false statements are. First of all he said that you know we're not talking, we're not really discussing with the MMA, we're not negotiating in good faith, and I say we are, so I guess there is the point of contention between the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and myself. I asked him a question and he did say they cancelled the last meeting. When I meet with Dr. Connelly, Dr. Peter Connelly, the person, the doctor, the individual, the practicing physician, I see a person that is totally different than when I meet the President of the MMA who is talking as a hard-nosed businessman, as a highly political individual. That's two different things. When I meet individual members of the MMA and talk about the new direction that should be taken in the future pertaining to health and related social services in Manitoba, I often hear of different opinions than when I sit with the MMA than when I talk with, say, the College of Physicians whether directly or through their registrar. Let that be known, let that be put on the record.

And when the honourable member says that doctors are not being trained in Manitoba, that we're not keeping the number of doctors that we should in the Province of Manitoba, let me put statistics on the record. Going back to 1963 and up to and including 1972 and let the record be straight pertaining to the doctors that we train and pertaining to the doctors that we get from elsewhere in Canada and elsewhere in the world and how many remain here. And let it be said that during this administration that a Faculty of Family Physicians was started. It wasn't started in 1959, it wasn't started in 1965 or 1968 or 69, it was started in the last four years and we said and maintained that it was needed, needed ten years ago. It will be needed in the next 50 years, so we started it. We helped start the Faculty of Family Physicians.

Here are the figures pertaining to doctors in Manitoba, and here I go back to 1963. I believe that the Conservatives were in power then, and let's see how progressive they were. In 1963, there were 1,181 doctors in Manitoba; 1964 there were 1,179 doctors in Manitoba. That was a decrease of 0.17. In 1965 there were 1,182. That was an increase of 0.25 percent. 1966, 1,197; 1967, 1,224; 1968, 1,294; 1969, 1,348; 1970, 1,401, and increase of 3.93; 1971, 1,453 and increase of 3.71; 1972, 1,511 and increase of 3.99 percent. --(Interjection)-- I'll just give this and I'll leave myself open for questions after if you don't mind.

Here is a -- according to a news release submitted by the College of Physicians in the fall of 1972. Medical practitioners registering in Manitoba by place of training, from 1963 to 1972. In 1963 Manitoba graduates staying in Manitoba, 26 - and I'll give the whole list right down to 1973. 1964, 30; 1965, 32; the year after, 20; 18; 32; 32; 37; 34; 1972, 53. That was a 56 percent increase from 1971.

Other Canadian graduates coming to Manitoba from elsewhere in Canada, from 1963 to 1972. In 1963 there were 12 doctors coming from elsewhere in Canada; 8; 13; 14; 12; 12; 14; 10; 19. How many in 1972? There were 21 of them. That was the highest on the record since 1963. So what's happening? Coming from elsewhere 1963 to 1972: 1963, 102; 1964, 109; 1965, 103; 1966, 91; 1967, 105; 124; 129; 137; 146. And how many in 1972? With this government that can't sit down and talk with the MMA, can't sit down and talk with the College of Physicians, that's causing all the doctors to leave this province, 171 came in from elsewhere, 171.

A MEMBER: How do like that?

MR. TOUPIN: Now let's look at the ratio, let's look at the ratio of doctors per population in the Province of Manitoba. Now these are facts and let's put them on the record. Let's look at 1968 with a co-called Progressive Conservative administration. In 1968 there was one physician per 739 population; 1969, happily when the New Democratic Party became the administration, one per 724. In 1971 one per 702; 1972, what was the ratio in 1972? It was one per 644. (Applause) How does that grab you? --(Interjection)-- No. No. No question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order please. Order. I no more than about ten minutes ago instructed members that they were not to rise unless they've got points of order, points of privilege, to interrupt a member that is already on the floor. Order. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, these apart from being statistics, are facts.

A MEMBER: Well I've got statistics too.

MR. TOUPIN: Well I'm very anxious to hear his statistics and see if they actually jive with the statistics that we have, the statistics that are produced by the College of Physicians

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . . and Surgeons, and the statistics that are furnished to us by the federal authorities. That's important.

The Honourable Member from Fort Garry made a statement that, I don't know, puzzled me in a sense when he said that the elimination of premiums, medical and hospital premiums of what used to be \$204.00 a year per family in April, 1969, becomes no taxes for hospital and medical services in 1973 meant very little. Well we happen to believe, and I sure hope that he talked to his colleague from Arthur because the Honourable Member for Arthur agreed with us, said that he agreed with the fact that we abolished the hospital and Medicare premiums, and the honourable member -- didn't you? And the Honourable Member for Fort Garry says it doesn't mean that much.

MR. SHERMAN: But there was another part of that sentence.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, well maybe there is but I comprehended that part . . .

MR. SHERMAN: The first half.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . which you said didn't mean very little -- I mean meant very little, and yet if -- I'm subject to be corrected -- but when the Budget was voted on I saw the honourable member stand up and vote for that Budget.

MR. SHERMAN: I'd do it again.

MR. TOUPIN: Did you remember that, colleagues and Mr. Chairman? That when the Budget vote was taken that there was no one, no one to my knowledge on either side of the House --(Interjection)-- Well I won't say that. I'm not ready to say that anyone skipped the vote because they were probably out on business, very important business. But everyone in this Honourable House, this august Chamber, got up and voted for the Budget --(Interjection)-- When did that happen previously in this beautiful province of ours? When did it happen? Can anyone in this House tell me when all members of the House . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. ENNS: I don't think that the Honourable Minister would like to represent --mis-represent the House. It happens in most budgets. It has happened in most budgets, and the records will prove that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. For the information of the honourable member -- ORDER -- For the information of the Honourable Member for Lakeside that was not a point of order.

MR. ENNS . . . Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a point of order - I'll speak on the point of order. The honourable member either deliberately, or through lack of knowledge, indicates, or imputes, to the members opposite a position that just simply isn't the case and that the record's do not bear. The records will indicate examination of the votes on previous budgets, within the last five or six years, where three or four, at least that I can recall the three or four that I sat in opposition to, where they passed without a vote, a dissenting vote, without a dissenting vote Mr. Chairman. That is my point of order. So there's nothing so outstanding about the fact that a Budget after having been scrutinized by the Opposition, and having motions of non-confidence moved, then having passed the Budget without dissent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. That is still not a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude in the last few minutes that I have to indicate that I really didn't pretend to know, because I haven't really been here that long, I was only elected in 1969, and I didn't know the record so I asked a question and the honourable member sttempted to give me an answer. I think I'll scrutinize the records myself and find out when all members of the House voted for the budget of the government and stood up, were called to stand up and vote for a budget.

I can tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that I as a Minister of the Crown and I as the MLA for Springfield will make that fact known in the next election, that the Progressive Conservatives, the Liberals, and all the Independents in the House, voted for the best budget presented yet. I think that's -- you know that should be made known. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Fort Garry at the next opportunity that he gets to give me his wisdom pertaining to what I believe is a sensible approach in regards to his own constituency. I've been approached on more than one occasion by different groups in his constituency pertaining to extended care facilities in tying in say with the Victoria General

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . . Hospital, the concept of health and social development centre, the concept of another mode of payment apart from fees for service for all practioners within such a facility, and the extension of that service based on the district, not a region because it is not possible.

I would like him to come forward when he gets a chance and to indicate to me, and to the government, what he feels his desires, his thoughts, his party policies are pertaining to this type of concept that seems to be somewhat accepted by a large portion of his constituents, by a large portion of professionals working within existing facilities in the Fort Garry area. I would really appreciate this.

Mr. Chairman, I'd have more comments to make pursuant to the negotiation that is now taking place with the Medical Association pertaining to conservations that I've had with the College of Physicians and Surgeons regarding their responsibility given to them in regards to the Medical Act, and so on and the pertinent sections that were discussed in this House in regards to services that are covered and not covered by Medicare, and so on, in regards to procedures that are authorized either directly through the Criminal Code or given authority through the Medical Act here in the Province of Manitoba. I feel that this would be of great benefit to the Members of this House, keeping in mind the conversations that I've had the privilege of having with the Minister of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 12:30 I'm leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.