

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 9, 1975

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this afternoon, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of the Tuxedo Shaftsbury School, Grade 11 standing under the direction of Mr. Perrett. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

We also have 12 students of the Sanford Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Hew. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris. On behalf of all members of the Assembly I bid you welcome this afternoon.

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 23 of your Estimate Books. Resolution 55(a)(2)-- The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want in this warm-up period to perhaps pursue some of the questions that we began to look at this morning and I was somewhat intrigued, Mr. Chairman, and I direct my comments through you to the Minister, about the way in which the estimates of this department are presented.

As I listened to the Minister present his description of activities and his re-definition of the new organizational chart, the thought struck me that this kind of description has been heard many times before and yet still begs the fundamental question and that is, with all the resources being applied to the Department of Health and Social Development and with all the reorganizing of individuals and to different kinds of position and to new organizational arrangement, is the health and welfare of Manitoba any better off as a result of all this. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of the things we desperately lack in the presentation, or have lacked in the presentation of this report, is something perhaps similar to what we receive when the Minister of Finance presents a budget where he at least tries to give some indicators of the economic health of the province based upon certain investment figures, or employment figures or whatever the case may be. And yet when we come to a department which consumes almost a third of that budget, we are not really given any information to find out whether over the succeeding years, the particular quality and standard of health or, the standard and quality of the position of those in lower income which is the other part of the responsibility of the department, have perspectively and measurably been improved or changed. And that it really isn't fair in many cases to try to establish for members of this committee some rationale for determining whether in fact the Minister is living up to his responsibilities as he's supposed to simply by talking about really what are mechanical things.

Because I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you can talk about new programs, I think the Minister talked about new geriatric programs and new alternate care programs and new pharmacare programs, without really saying whether in fact the kind of conditions that those programs are supposed to meet are any worse or any better or what are we aiming at when we introduce these programs? What kind of thing are we trying to do with that program. Are we simply trying to enable older people to live longer? Are we trying to insure not only do they get old but that during their elderly years they in fact live a healthier life during that. Is it simply a survival philosophy or is it in fact an improvement philosophy. And yet increasingly, I find myself - I think I share or am really part of a large group of people in this province who are beginning to wonder about some of the relevance of these programs, in terms of whether we keep extending them, expanding them, enlarging them, changing them, altering them, whether we end up really any different, any better off than we were before.

I'm not saying that that isn't so, I'm just saying that the Minister and his department and this executive function has provided us with really no basis for determining that, and we're supposed to simply judge upon new programs in a vacuum, and simply saying, are we supposed to agree that all new programs are good and all old programs are bad or are we supposed to be much more realistic and say, here is a condition that had to be met, that is here is a certain number of people in the province who are facing certain problems and we want to improve their condition to this point. We want to improve their nutrition, we want to improve their ability to be mobile, we want to improve their ability to make a living, we want to improve their ability to enjoy clear air, whatever the condition may be, and that's what the new program is trying to do. Instead we got kind of a mechanical list of what we're doing and what we're not doing

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) and how we're economizing without really saying what the impact is going to be, what the consequences are.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is for that reason that the Department of Health and Social Development has become as gargantuan and as unwieldy as it is simply because we sort of keep adding extensions and additions on to this initial structure without really knowing why we're doing it. Someone comes up with a helluva good idea and is able to get some Assistant Deputy Minister to think it's a good idea and the memos go through and the Minister who is also trying to put out fires with doctors and everything else says well okay I'll pass that and signs a slip and off we go, and before you know what was an experimental program then becomes a demonstration program, a demonstration program becomes a committed program and before you know it, you're into four or five million dollars and you end up sort of saying hey, where have we gotten to, and has it really changed things very much. And I would suggest if you begin to look at some statistics or indicators, and I don't have them all in front of me, Mr. Chairman, but I am raising this kind of question for this reason, is that we don't really have, I guess if you want to call it a state of the health kind of position put forward by the Minister, we really have a program, organizational statement which really is pretty useless when you get down to it, you know, and when you really fundamentally look at it, it's a pretty useless statement that the Minister provided because it doesn't tell us an awful lot other than he's got . . . It's like saying that I've shuffled the chairs around on the deck of the Titanic, yes, we've moved them into a different location. The ship still may be going down but we're going to be going down in a different somewhat seating arrangement than we were last year. I find that to be a really kind of a sad commentary that when we're spending well over \$300 million, it's a pretty substantial amount, and when we are trying to --(Interjection)-- Oh my God, we're sinking, that's right.

I would like to raise that, Mr. Chairman, because I think that there are some critical issues that haven't been faced in this department concerning the capacity of the Department of Health and Social Development to identify some of the areas of interest that should be looked at and because they may not fit a particular philosophy or a particular approach are not being looked at, and whether really in fact that there is, at the present time, the reaction time and the response time to these issues that there should be. So as a result we are simply extending and promoting for the sake almost of extension and promotion as opposed to having clear-cut objectives. And where that becomes a serious concern to me, Mr. Chairman, is in this respect, that when we run into a problem which I think we all face - and I don't put special blame upon the present Minister of Health and Social Development, in fact I would cover this total Legislature with the allocation of blame - when we look at the kind of almost expedient growth in health cost care that we're facing, I suppose to the point where if it keeps going the way it is we could easily bankrupt the province in three or four years if we just simply kept on the same line of thought. One reason why we're heading that way is that we don't know what we're trying to do with health care. We don't know what kind of direction we're aiming at because we don't have really a measure of what we're trying to achieve with it.

Are we trying to say we should be eliminating the incidence of cancer in the province in order to allow people who are over 45 who have by far the highest morbidity rate with cancer to live healthier lives within that period, and is that why we should be putting more money into cancer research and surgery and all the rest of the preventative programs. Or are we trying to say that we're trying to deal with the sort of state of mental health in the province, and I must paraphrase that, Mr. Chairman, by saying some of the interesting statistics that I did come across was that Manitoba leads the country in terms of psychiatric admissions.

A MEMBER: Five years of NDP government!

MR. AXWORTHY: Well I was going to say, and I think the only cause I can find in the change of statistics is from the point of time when this government got elected. Two things happened. We began to admit more people into mental institutions and the suicide rate jumped. And I think the suicide rate jumped particularly around the Richardson Building and the Lombard area of Winnipeg and people hurtling themselves out of windows because of economic depression or something, but the fact is that here is some interesting and somewhat, I suppose alarming, statistics that presumably the mental health of Manitobans is not as good as it should be.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, just for directions. I was under the impression that this year there was an agreement that we would keep the Minister's salary to the end and

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) talk about this kind of policy or generalities that the honourable member is speaking now. I thought that this was the idea, to go line by line and then finish with that and I see that we're covering the waterfront right now. I don't really care but I would like to have some direction on that to know what we're supposed to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. I would caution the honourable member to address himself to 55(a)(2). And before I recognize him again I would like to draw . . . Order please. Order please.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I ask the honourable member to continue, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of the Arden School, Grades 5 and 6, under the direction of Mr. John Toews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. On behalf of the members of the Chamber I bid you welcome this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT Cont'd

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'd like to. Well I think that in present circumstances it's more than easy to keep cool I think because we're almost being frozen out by the kinds of answers we're being given. I simply want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that on the point of order raised by the Minister either I'm mistaken or he's mistaken, but I would like to suggest to him that under 55(a)(2) we are talking about the executive function of government. We're talking about salaries being paid to senior policy makers in his department. And as I listened to his introduction he in fact pointedly and directly used that introduction to suggest that he was reorganizing the department to gain better policy advice, to provide better administration and more effectiveness, and I would say that if we are talking about the executive function being performed by the administrative organization of his department under Section 55(a)(2) then that's exactly what I'm talking about. Is it being organized to deal with the kind of problems we have to face with. And I don't intend to cover the waterfront, I intend to cover matters dealing with Health and Social Development. If he wants to deal with the waterfront, he should go and deal with the Harbour Board Commission in the federal level. Because I want to deal really with the capacity of his present organizational structure to cope with the kinds of requirements that this House has in determining whether he is policy-making in an effective way or not.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it's immaterial to me how we proceed, but I was informed that I had up to an hour to introduce my estimates - and that of course was left to me how to use that, that wasn't under (2) at all, it was just when my estimates started - and that we were then going to go line by line, that after that we would finish with the Minister's salary, that we could cover the whole department. Now, you know, there's always many ways to get around some way, if we don't want to deal with it this way. He's not right when he says that this item is dealing with all the senior people and the policy makers, it's dealing with the Deputy Minister. And I guess he can stretch the point and make the same speech on the Deputy Minister's salary if he feels that the Deputy Minister is running the department. This is fine. I'm not going to quarrel with him, I just want him to know.

You know, I've been here four months, I could probably get a darn good speech that my staff could write and really try to con these people across the aisle. It is a very big department, I thought it would be much better to go line by line, to talk about exactly the programs that my friends want to talk about. It would certainly be of some benefit to me and to them, I'm ready to accept any criticism, any constructive criticism and I'm not complaining. If this is your wish or this is the wish of the Opposition that we are supposed to go back to what we were doing before, start and stay on this and cover the whole department, that's fine. And my honourable friend is right. That's the question. Am I right or is he right in our understanding? But I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, and my honourable friends that I'm not complaining. I just want to know what rules we're playing with. You know, he could stretch this and say this is the Deputy Minister. He's right. I'm not going to argue with him but was that the intent of this House when they changed the rules or agreed to change the rules?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think the point is well taken. I think if the honourable

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd). . . . member wants to debate the general policy of the department, it is under the Minister's salary. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the point because I think the Minister's belaboured it much too long already. But I would like to suggest to him - and I don't intend to give the same speech when the Minister's salary comes up, I have a totally different speech about his own personal capacity to carry out the job. What I am concerned about at this stage is in his introduction and on his development of this particular line of argument as we got into it this morning, he is describing the re-organization of the department into a new form of division of responsibility between one Deputy Minister who is looking after administration, one who's going to look after policy. We are trying to find out whether in fact that is the way in which we should be approaching the problems of the department, and I certainly intend to go line by line because in a lot of them there are very many important and specific points.

But what I am trying to suggest to the Minister now, if he cares to listen, is that in dealing with re-organization and dealing with the attempts to construct a departmental structure and approach that would enable him to carry out the executive function, which is in my mind a sense of overall planning, overall co-ordination, overall sort of assessment of the relevancy of programs, I'm saying that at this point we don't have any such thing. And if we have to make a specific criticism under this point, that's the criticism we're making. I don't care how many Deputy Ministers he re-organizes or shifts around or puts into new chairs or sits down sort of, whether he has sort of an advisory board, or doesn't have an advisory board or whatever it is, the fact of the matter is that I think that the department is still basically really a haphazard one. And that it doesn't really have any relevancy because it doesn't know what it's trying to do, it's simply trying to sort of decide things as issues arise as opposed to trying to zero in and focus on specific objectives related to improving certain health conditions, whether it's to deal with people who are unhealthy and we want to make them healthy, or try to keep people who are healthy in the same state.

I was simply using the illustration that whereas when we received in some cases the presentation by other Ministers looking at the function of their executive part of their department, we are able to make some judgments about the relevancy of those structures by having indicators to determine whether in fact there is some success or failure, and I'm simply saying, here all that we have is a description of programs. And frankly programs in a vacuum are really pretty irrelevant. They may achieve something, but if you don't have anything to measure them against what's the point of doing them. I think that is the fundamental fact that we're trying to aim at. I would take your advice, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to cover the whole department, I think that that is not my intention, but I do want to raise some very serious reservations really about the present planning and organizational function of this department in terms of what it is trying to achieve. Particularly because of its immense command upon the budget of this government and particularly because we must sort of be sort of adjusting ourselves to the question of do we presently have the executive capacity in this department to relate expenditures to actual functions and purposes so that we can ensure that we're going to get some real results from our money, because we, frankly, can't do everything. We have to begin deciding what we want to do. If this is the place to bring it up then that was the point of my remarks. And I think that in carrying out with that I would simply suggest that the Minister would have been much better spending his time rather than trying to rebut a procedural matter, trying to suggest or at least concede that perhaps he was not right, or that improvements will be made by the time we get to the same part of the estimates next year, in being able to present to this House a realistic appraisal really of the state of health of the province in terms of providing specific indicators and then determining really how he has set up his reorganization to focus upon those.

And in saying that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to then continue to ask the Minister some questions because I don't think that we got full answers this morning, and I'm sure there are full answers available, really about the, not only the organizational connections inside his department but really the relationships that have existed by those other sorts of creatures of government that have emerged in recent years called Planning and Priorities and HESP and all the rest of it. Because there was a time, Mr. Chairman, when I believe that HESP was the sort of godfather of health and social policy in the province and every time someone wanted

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) to do something there was some directive or fiat coming down from this thing called HESP. Now I find out that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation is actually chairing that and while I have great admiration and confidence in the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, I think it would be useful to know where is the planning and policy-making function residing at this present time? Is it in this new structure that the Minister talks about? Is it in HESP? What does HESP do? Is it simply to evaluate what comes up through the department itself. Did the policy planning group or whatever it is the Minister described sitting in the department actually develop it and HESP just evaluate it or does it come from the top down. Those are the kind of things that we are concerned about in this initial stage to determine whether in fact we have the kind of machinery that we should have in order to get proper health and social planning in this province. So perhaps we can start on that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will try to expend a little more to satisfy my honourable friend although I must confess that I didn't realize that I would have to answer for HESP at this time but I see where my honourable friend has a valid point when he talks about planning in this field of health. And I purposely did not go into details in my introduction. As you know, I haven't been in that department very long, I guess that everybody that takes over certain responsibilities sees different things as a different style and starts by what he thinks himself is his responsibility, are his priorities to do the kind of things that we all want, and I don't think that there would be much of an argument if we started talking about what we want for the people of Manitoba in this field. I will try, nevertheless, to give him an idea of how I see the planning taking place.

First of all I should explain that HESP is nothing more than a sub-committee of Cabinet. There's been too much work in Cabinet, you meet once a week or so, there's so much work and that you want to give it a little more, should I say, study and so on, so the Cabinet has been formed, there's been certain committees, sub-committees and HESP is one of them. So Cabinet might have certain programs that they normally would originate, they will ask HESP to develop it and there are certain things that are very important that might originate in our department or in the Department of Education and so on and instead of going straight to Cabinet, the routine is that we go to HESP where these people will scrutinize a little more and then the minutes of HESP, like all the minutes of sub-committees have to be approved by the Cabinet.

My honourable friend mentioned the question of planning and, you know, maybe I'm going to walk a tight-rope because I can only say what I personally feel. I was away from the government, I was away from this House for a year and I did work in this field of health and I've had some impressions, some feelings and I don't know if this will meet with the approval of my colleagues on this side of the House. But I must say that I felt that the planning in this department left an awful lot to be desired, my honourable friend is right, and we had a situation where the people didn't know who was doing the planning for what and it was that there was very little planning, there's so much going on in this department that you had, you know, these programs were right on you and there was not enough long-range planning.

In the last year, not just now, the last year I think that the Minister, with his staff, and I was a member of his staff during that time, I think we tried to remedy this and my honourable friend is probably talking about the White Paper which - they had a staff of HESP, the present Deputy Minister of the department was the secretary of HESP at the time and he developed through the guidance of Cabinet and sub-committee of HESP, and I certainly don't think that any responsibility has to be placed, or credit has to be placed on the shoulders of any members of the staff. This was the sub-committee of HESP that wanted certain policies and the staff of HESP at the time, the planning in this field was mostly left with the people on HESP and that created difficulties at a time - there's no point in hiding that - at the Commission, for instance, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, but this was rectified about a year ago, that these people, most of the planning, many of these people were then assigned to the Manitoba Health Services Commission, we tried to set up a planning group out there and this is one of the reasons my honourable friend feels that I'm attaching too much importance in the changing of chairs or organizing the top echelon. Well I can't quarrel with him if this is the way he feels, but I think it's the most important for me anyway, I see things in a different way, I have the responsibility. I'm not a conformist, I don't really believe that you have to go by the same style all the time of this routine that we've had. I think that a lot of that is passe, so in this large department I've tried to, instead of one or two persons having all the responsibilities,

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) there's an awful lot of administration and so on, so we appointed Mr. Johnstone as Associate Deputy Minister in charge of administration. There is a lot of programs.

The Manitoba Health Services Commission is more than an insurance group for the province, you know, it's not that they don't really deliver the program like the department does, and this is very important because there's a lot of new programs that have to be improved and my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition this morning was talking about single unit delivery which we definitely are trying to do. So the Deputy Minister is focusing on that. He is going to try to make these programs work. At one time he had to look at administration and so on and there was too much. It became a bottleneck as far as I'm concerned and this is not what we wanted. Well the Deputy Minister will look at the delivery of the program and this has been organized with two Assistant Deputy Ministers. This is the - I shouldn't say it's the important part of the department, they're all important, but this is where the direction is going.

Then we have a group of medical people in the department who I felt should be elevated to work like professionals and so on and that they could certainly serve the department as advisors in this field and so on and we could make better use of them. So we had Dr. Tavener as the Chief Medical Consultant, to co-ordinate their efforts, to act as a liaison, we were talking this morning of having liaison with different people that work in this field who are experts and this is what we want to do and we are using Dr. Tavener and the staff of doctors to work on this. The Commission, well we'll come back to the commission later on. We have a director out there and there's a bill in front of you to have some minor changes in the commission because there is no idea to con anybody here. There is no doubt that the policy even at the commission will be determined by the government but that leaves an awful lot of work for the commission.

Now there are two other important steps that are not completely finished and one is in the planning - excuse me, there is something else that has been decided since then that I forgot. Instead of just talking to one or two fellows or having a fellow that might have been a farmer or a funeral director who all of a sudden won an election as a Minister of Health, doesn't become an expert from one day to the other. So to take advantage of the knowledge that different people have, the senior people set up a policy committee that meets every week with the senior people in there as the permanent members of this policy committee and any other directors of any program is invited and they come as full members of the committee, it's an internal policy committee, and we either look at directives from Cabinet, either Cabinet directly or through the sub-committee of HESP or anything that might originate in our department, and we prepare this, we give it a good run.

What I am trying to do also instead of having just what we might call the idea people come in with a program that might look very good on paper but that might be very costly and so on, we have the administrators in there on this team, all these people that develop these programs or these papers will tell us what we'll be locked into and what will it mean in two years and three years and to see if there's a proper evaluation mechanism to see that this is a good program that we should continue and also to consult and to advise in the best way to get some federal bucks in there and cost-sharing and so on. So this is going to be done.

We had difficulty with the institutions that are under the government in Selkirk and Brandon and so on, so instead of having just an administrator there has been an internal board of senior people, chaired by Dr. Tavener, the chief psychiatrist for the province who will be responsible for these hospitals.

There's a very important one which my honourable friend talked about, it's the planning. In my lack of knowledge I felt that we can build a large planning division that would do all the planning and so on and we gave this an awful lot of thought, and it came in that the planning - when I say planning, I'm talking about evaluation of what research, statistics and development of programs and so on, so this work is practically done now and I think we will set it up that I think we'll see that part of this planning team will be done at a higher level, at the policy committee close to the Minister and so on, the evaluation will be done by people that are not actually delivering the service because we want this a little removed. It wouldn't be fair to have the same people develop the program, sell the program, be responsible for delivery of the program and then evaluating these programs, so this will be done mostly at the resource under Mr. Johnstone and so on. And then there's the one that will get the implementation of the program and so on. I'd be pleased to discuss that with my friend or announce it in the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) House when we've got something definite and final on that, we haven't got at this time.

There is another area that concerns me very much. I think that in this department there is about \$20 million that are going to outside agencies. I think one of the worst things that ever happened in this province and probably in other provinces, as far as I'm concerned is the LIP programs. LIP programs were coming in that were supposed to be make-work programs. The Federal Government placed some money, and I'm not going to comment on how it was done because I don't know if any other parties could have done better, but this worked for a year or so and all these people then are running to the province because the Federal Government will drop them and the first thing we know we have programs that might be policy, might not be policy. So this has been a difficult situation. We need more staff than we have at the present to look at that. Unfortunately we haven't been able to give the information to people as fast as we would like to give them. We want a board first of all that will look - I'm talking about internally now - that will look at the program to see first of all if it's government policy, to see if it makes sense, to see if there's not repetition and to see also if there are some programs that we have ourselves that this is not duplication and so on.

This is a very difficult thing to do because everybody wants money from the government and they all do a pretty good job of lobbying. I know that you've aware of that because I am sure that most of you have received letters from one group or another that the government doesn't want to give them the money and so on. So this is something that has to be looked at very thoroughly. I personally am very much in favour of voluntary work. There are certain things that are done now, and even through an act of legislation, a responsibility of government that is being delivered by some of these people. So this is another area that we're not completely set up and I hope that we will pretty soon and I think that this will improve the situation. As I said, I purposely did not go into all these details when we came in because I was under the impression, and I stand to be corrected if I was wrong, that this would be exactly the best way because, you know, I would be accused of choosing the programs that I want. I have some terrific speechwriters that work for me. I could have a terrific speech in no time and I thought it would be much better, there's no point in me conning me, and I've got a heck of a lot to learn. Also that if we went line by line and go with every single one, I'm not going to try to evade any one at all, any programs at all. We focus on a program and talk about the merits of the program and then having seen the weak spot of the department and so on that you would hit me at the end on the Minister's salary. So it doesn't matter that much to me how we do it. I want to assure my honourable friend that I am not trying to evade anything, that I'll try if I haven't got the information, I'll try to get the information on any of the programs.

Now I think that it's a little more than just mechanics. I think that this organization, which was started - it's not something that I started with, but started and gradually it's falling into place - it was started a few years ago. And I think that finally where we can spread the work and go to the top man for certain jobs, I think that we will be much better. But that is not to say that the government has no idea where they're going, they have no policy at all, I don't think that's the case at all. As I said this morning, it is a department, it is an area where Manitoba has led in many ways and no doubt they'll make mistakes. You know, you can always find somebody that will wrap themselves all in cotton batting and then lock the room or something, they're not going to be in trouble, they're not doing a damn thing. We'll make mistakes, we'll make a lot of mistakes, but I can assure you that it won't be because of lack of sincerity or lack of trying. And I would hope, and I think this is the idea here today, that while we go through this exercise that the opposition will keep me and the rest of our staff on our toes and will point out if they feel if we're going in a direction that might not be for the best of Manitoba, and I think together with a strong opposition and with a government that cares, that we will be able to provide the kind of services that our people are entitled to, the people that I'm sure all of us would want to give them.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the Minister's response. I think that it's certainly much clearer now about the locus of where some of the decisions are being made, and I would hope that I didn't . . . I was trying to listen quite carefully to what the Minister had to say, and I believe what I heard him say is that the former planning function, executive planning function that used to be exercised under the sub-committee of Cabinet, called HESP, has now been basically disbanded, and that the staff of that has been transferred

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) in part to the Health Services Commission. I believe that was in part, that would raise to me: First the question is then, does the Health Services Commission become the place where, in fact, we can assume that the overall plan of allocating resources into health will be determined. I also believe then he said that there was a policy group composed of senior members of the department that meet with the Minister on a regular basis to determine that.

I would like first to determine whether the White Paper on Health Care, having been developed by HESP, has it been washed out, or is it now being implemented, or has it been elaborated upon? Coming down to the point of, I'm still trying to determine whether when the Minister sits down to decide when he brings his estimates before this House, and it's getting these different kinds of recommendations for program, in the health care field for example, whether there is some blueprint that he's working with at this stage, or whether that planning group has taken several steps back and is starting with a new blueprint. And let me continue, Mr. Chairman, by saying that if there is such a thing, if there is some kind of rough set of guidelines as to where you're trying to push the health delivery system in the province, could we know about it? Do we know roughly what the basic priorities are at this stage? Well what does this policy planning group now say, at least in the interim before the final document is revealed to the world? Where are we now? What kind of priorities have been set by this group?

And the other question, which I think was raised this morning, Mr. Chairman, was, at what point and where exactly does the public get plugged into this? At what point do the many agencies, all the way from the professions, the medical professions, through to the other kinds of health agencies which are working the field, at what point are they asked to come in and determine whether their own activity fits this kind of internal blueprint that the Minister, I believe, says he now has some sense of what he's working on? I wonder if he could answer those two questions.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't want to mislead. I am not saying that with the work of the White Paper group or HESP is all to be started over again. That's not the case at all. I think that it was clearly indicated at the time, during the last few years, what became policy. Many of these White Paper recommendations became government policy. There has been an awful lot of change in the last few years, and at the risk of disappointing the members of the opposition, I might say that this year I would want to hold back a bit and get the things that we've started going, make sure that it's done properly, because, you know, we've had so many things going on. I'm not saying there's not going to be any new programs. We have the dental care for children; it's going to take an awful lot of work to get this thing going properly. There is this kind of work.

Now the White Paper group was assembled, and many of them had been seconded from the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and they were preparing I guess what you could call the guidelines in this field for the government, and this was done. Then when they tried to go ahead with these projects it caused a difficulty because of not always the best relationship with the Commission that was a bit independent. This is what I'm admitting now. So discussing with the Minister at the time when the White Paper group had pretty well finished their group, or the planning group that had been seconded and attached to HESP; there was a reason for that, and now they have got this large staff at HESP and the planning will be done at the Department and the Commission. But a year ago most of these people were transferred to the Commission. We have received . . . I think this is what we had during the estimates, when we went in front of Cabinet, this is what we hit for, mostly for people that would evaluate the program, the planners, and so on, and we had an increase of quite a few staff man-years in that direction, and we will work very closely with the Commission. Maybe I should say now to make sure that my honourable friend understands, instead of waiting until this bill goes through, that it will not change the Commission too much except it will make it quite clear that the policies will be the responsibility of the government. It's no use pretending and playing games because no one would believe it anyway. So this is clearly the responsibility of the department, so the planning will be done in conjunction with the two groups.

But now the policy committee - again I don't want to mislead - the policy committee hasn't got a mandate to say, here you're going to develop something like the White Paper did, it's something that will always - while I'm there anyway - will remain. It is something that

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) instead of having an idea that maybe somebody in the department somewhere thinks it's a good idea and they all of a sudden hit you with this, or bring it to HESP or something, will not go anywhere until it's gone through the policy committee, where it will have to be a pretty good program because you'll have everybody taking pot shots at it, and it works quite a bit like the Opposition. You have administrators that will find out, to see, yes this is good, but if you modify it you will be able to cost-share with Ottawa, somebody that knows these things, not just a fellow that has a good idea but doesn't know how to work it; another fellow will tell you what the cost will really be and what you will be tied in the next year, and the next year, and then you will have somebody that is responsible for the delivering of these programs and will say, yes on paper this is terrific but when it comes to deliver there is no way that it could be done unless you change this. So it will be this kind of a committee. But, you know, there's no big thing that my honourable friend said that we are going to announce to the world in a few months, or something about policy. We will take the policies as they come along.

Now to try to tell you that I foresee in this coming year, a big announcement in this field, no, I think that we've got to do well what we're doing, there's a bit of re-organization. It's been done in steps and during the last few years. Let's go back to even when the previous government was there, because I don't think that's an ideology thing, it's a big department, two departments that were fused together for certain reasons, because most of these deliveries is done by the same people through the same method. So I certainly will commit myself to any time that there is any direction of government, any new policies, to inform the House and to inform the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, to set the record straight and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I'd like to inform him in as clear a language as I possibly can, the Order-in-Council appointing the HESP committee and its members is still in force. It hasn't been revoked. There has been a change in the policy of the operation of HESP itself in regard to its main responsibility as intended at the beginning, and still remains, in regard to reviewing existing policy, in regard to contemplating new policy for the departments that sit on HESP, and any delegated policy pertaining to Cabinet, as intended to be reviewed by HESP, that is still in force. The working group as it was actually constituted is no longer with HESP. The working group was sent back to the respective departments, being Education especially, Health and Social Development, and when a study is to be conducted in regard to reviewing a policy, whether it be existing or contemplated, a secondment of staff takes place from the given departments to HESP, which is called HESPO, Health, Education and Social Planning Officials, that review the policy and make recommendations to Cabinet. Now Cabinet takes a decision pertaining to that recommended policy, whether it be had by the Planning and Research Secretariats of the given departments or HESP itself. But HESP, as was intended at the beginning, remains the ongoing . . . holding hands of administrative matters is no longer with HESP and in my mind was never intended.

. . . . continued on next page

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought that I was clear when the Minister of Health and Social Development described it. I'm not so sure now that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation has got up to sort of redescribe it, really whether we're not back again in that kind of Byzantine maze work. It's no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that we don't have a very clear-cut policy because if it has to try to . . . if any piece of policy tries to wend its way through all those channels, it's no wonder that I'm sure that the papers are bound to get lost in I don't know how many desks. Mr. Chairman, I think that is the concern I'd raise. I sympathize in a large part with the task of the Minister trying to bring some cohesion to all these kinds of things, and I think maybe where we are at fault is that we've become so mesmerized by this planning function, or whatever it is, that we've almost sort of begun to think that you have planning if you have a number of people doing it, which I don't think is the case at all. What strikes me, Mr. Chairman, in particular is that one of the causes for a high degree of confusion in the public mind, and in the minds of professionals outside, and in the minds of those who are in the various parts of the health caring services, is that they don't know who is making decisions, and they don't know what the decisions are, and they don't know where we're trying to head. As a result what happens is that everyone tries to make his case, and everyone tries to make his representation.

I would suggest that one of the serious causes of conflict presently in the province, as we see our kind of regular Friday afternoon demonstrations, or whatever they may be, is simply that I don't think the government has yet come clean as to what it wants to do. I know that there's a certain reluctance to commit yourself to saying, here's where we want to go, but other governments have over periods of time - I know they use White Papers or Green Papers or Orange Papers, or whatever it is, and they intend to engender some discussion and some reaction so, at least, there may be the building of a consensus between all the disparate parts of the system. I realize just how large and really complex the whole health care delivery system is in the province, there's just so many parts to it. But it seems to me that if each part is simply setting its own objectives according to its own peculiar vested concerns without any relationship to some overall objective, then that's why we wind up sort of having people wanting more money and people wanting more programs, because they don't feel that . . . there's no sense of where they're aiming at, and that's the point I'm trying to get at. At what stage do we get from this government a very clear definition of saying, okay, frankly folks this is what we think has got to happen in the next five or ten years in the health care in the province. These are the priorities, this is where we think the money should go, this is the way we want to do it. Now let's find out what you think. So that there is that kind of ability to react, to discuss, to consult in a fairly open kind of way, as opposed to - I really think what is happening now is that we're like a group of blind men trying to go through a mine field at midnight, that everyone is sort of inching his way slowly and sometimes panicking and jumping up and sort of running. As a result we're having the kind of explosions that we get ourselves into.

I realize the Minister is new and sincerely I think that I'm encouraged in part by his honesty in saying that there wasn't planning going before, or that the planning that was going on was bad. I think it's a frank admission and I think one that we appreciate. But what I am asking for now is, where do you go from here? Even if you want some time, and I certainly, for one, am prepared to say, take all the time you need between now and next year, at least, to come up with that kind of set of recommendations to the province about where we should be putting our health dollars and where we think the real priority for health care is. But when does it come out open? When does sort of the hospitals and the doctors, and the nurses and the paramedical professionals and the health caring agencies and the suppliers and the public and the clients and the patients, and all the rest, when do we find out, and when do we get a chance to sort of react to this kind of thing so that through some procedure of exchange, we can at least develop a generally agreed upon set of objectives, and then I think many of the problems that the Minister now faces in having to put out fires and deal with angry clients, would be eased because there would be some common set of principles.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm now convinced more than ever that our real weak spot is a Minister that could really explain what's going on or some kind of PR department. Because what my honourable friend is asking for . . . I did admit that we've had difficulties because of the planning, especially at the Commission, and so on, and I'm saying that this was done. The White Paper group, the group under HESP, did a lot of good work but we've got - I

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) would venture to say, more than any other province in Canada, we know where we're going. My honourable friend knows that because we've made some public statements re the rationalization of hospital and nursing home beds. That's one thing, and we can talk about that for quite awhile. I think that we know where we're going.

I have announced a policy, and I think that it was clear at the time, re geriatric care, which is something that we'll be the first one in Canada to do in this area. We have tried to get people out of institutions, very much. This is a clear-cut policy. We are going to try to do that in the mental field, and any other field, have more people outside or stay in their community. I would hope that you will see the days that there won't be a Selkirk and Brandon, that there will be areas in different communities, and so on. We've closed many beds, and we'll close more, in Brandon and Selkirk. That's a clear-cut policy.

We've talked about community health centres, that's another thing. We've talked about district health system, and this is what I was talking about this morning, that you will have the people in an area, we'll start with . . . there will be some kind of a pilot project going on in the City that I announced, in St. Boniface, because of their geriatric hospital, and so on, but this will be mostly in the rural points where you get people . . . the present board of hospitals, the present board of nursing homes, the people that are delivering home care, the people that are giving public nursing, mental health, and so on, and we will try to as much as possible have the single unit delivery . . . This board will present to the government the kind of program that they want, and they will decide in the priorities within - there are certain things that are covered by the government of course.

So, you know, I think it's a little unfair - we'll always have people that criticize us, especially, as I said this morning, when we're leading, but I think it's not right to say that this government doesn't know where we're going and that we are not telling the public. I think that the policies that I explain now are very important policies, policies that other provinces haven't stated, that we're stating quite clearly and strongly, and even though there's been some criticism, and we can take the one on geriatric care that's going on. Now who do we discuss it with? Well we will have these different boards.--(Interjection)--Well of course there's the welfare side also. We know exactly what we want. We would like to try and get the unemployed employable people back to work as much as possible. I must say that I've always had a hang-up over that, I see that this is very much exaggerated. There is not that many but we still want to do more in this. I think that the best way to do it is have some incentive for the people to work and help the working poor and so on. In this we're working very hard with the other provinces, with the Federal Government because this is something that needs participation by the Federal Government. In the field of health also we've been the leaders at these conferences where we're trying to have the Federal Government to agree to give us a little bit more flexibility instead of insuring only . . . the acute beds were the easiest way to do because we get half the money from Ottawa to build more and more acute beds that are not needed, and then we haven't got the proper personal care beds or home care service and so on. But there's an indication that the ten provinces and the Federal Government are quite close to this and I see some marked improvement very soon on this. So, you know, there are certain things that we know we want but we're depending on the Federal Government in certain areas.

Now as far as discussing with people. Just a few months before the former Minister left, he agreed for instance to meet with the Colleges of Physicians more often and I've met with them and after the session I intend to meet more often with them, to look at standards, to look at different things that we need. As I say, we will meet with the Boards. And maybe this is the time to talk about the medical profession because I think some of my remarks have been misunderstood or misrepresented. There is nothing that I personally would like more than to discuss the question of health with the medical profession. I say the medical profession because we've had some people, the same people that are wearing different hats, I've asked different doctors to come and advise us on certain things, to work on certain committees, it's been terrific. They just tell us what they think and that's it, take it or leave it, this is my advice, the expertise that I have, my interest, and so on. It's been very difficult to work with the MMA as an organization, and it's easy to understand because when I was chairman of the Commission I suggested to the MMA, well where do you want to be plugged in - I'm ready, when we're just developing programs and so on, that was mostly what concerned them, in the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) responsibilities of the commission and so on - so where do you want to be plugged in. I can even plug you in before we go to the Minister to help us give the proper advice to the Minister. And the answer was, well that's impossible because if we send you a doctor that is representing the MMA he'll be afraid to talk, or if he says something that you use in there, that might not be approved by the MMA or the general membership. Because they have to report to the MMA and I'm convinced that this will not work. I want to have a consultative committee with the MMA to deal with economics mostly and to have general discussion, we had our Deputy Minister who was quite interested in those community clinics and so on who was invited, suggested by us to go and discuss with the MMA and with the consultative committee this general question. I think it was a very good thing because then the president of the MMA went around the rural areas and discussed that with the medical doctors and those people that were so afraid that the government was trying to take everything over and that every doctor would be working for the government and so on, have been relieved. You know, there is not this fight that some might want to think or think that there is with the medical profession at all, far from it, I think that we're possibly closer now. I think that there's been a good start with the former Ministers and I certainly want to pursue this and this is, as I said earlier, one of the reasons why we set up the chief medical consultant to liaise with these groups, so I think that we will improve in this way. And as far as the public, well what better way than to go ahead and set up these boards that will represent, that will be made up of every type of people that are dealing with the care in their own communities, people that are on boards of hospitals, nursing homes, home care, doctors, public health nurses and so on. I think that we are very much in the right direction, so you know maybe we're not telling our story well enough. I think that in the last four years, I think that now the people are starting to think, to realize that they don't have to be so afraid of this government, that all voluntary groups will be thrown out, that every doctor will be employed by the government, because this is not the intention at all. And when I took the stand that I did with the MMA and I said that I will not accept that they will threaten us by withdrawing services, this is exactly what I meant. And I'm not stacking the cards against the medical profession because they've got enough to keep me on my toes and to keep me honest, because the last thing that I want to do, and this government wants to do, is to see these people opting out. I think that one thing that I want to establish, that we're going to sit down like intelligent people, people that respect each other and not one group that's afraid of the other, and unfortunately during the last year this is what was happening. We'd meet in consultative committee, we've had a good rapport, everybody was happy, the next day there was a press statement that the commission or the government wasn't acting in good faith and so on. And that has to stop. You can only work with this kind of attitude for awhile.

I defy anybody who said there's been name calling from both sides to look, from the day that that contract was signed - what was that? - January last year in '74, to see where the government attacked the doctors and to any issue until I took my strong stand when I asked the medical profession to let me address them and answer their questions. And I want to make it quite clear that we are going to get the proper people, the proper staff, that we'll know what's going on in the rest of the province, across Canada, that we'll recommend the fairest schedule of fees possible and we will discuss with the MMA on this. But, after, in good faith, once we've decided or what we . . . this is it. There will not be this threat because we will not accept that, I will never accept that they're going to threaten me by saying I'm going to withdraw service. Because this is a profession that has fought for the right to work within or outside of a government program and they have this right. They have this right in this province and there's other provinces who are not socialistic government that haven't got that right, you know, and let's talk about that with my honourable friend from the conservative party who has made statements that I kind of rejected because I don't know if he really knows what he's saying on this, or if he knows what's going on in other provinces, and that is the part that I don't like at all. You can't be on both sides at the same time, say that was a good statement but the Minister is grandstanding. You've got to do certain things sometimes when you've got a responsibility. And I'm saying, but there will be this threat. There will be this threat that if they feel in their fairness, the medical profession feel that our schedule of fees is not adequate, well then they will withdraw and that's the last thing we want to do. Because that would hurt the plan. But then we're also protected, we don't think that they will be able to march all the people . . . it's okay for the profession who didn't really understand what was going on. To

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) this day a lot of them were telling me that they thought that we were trying to prevent them from opting out of the plan. And when they'll have to think of collecting their own fees and so on, that's worth something. When we started Medicare they were saying we'll work for 85 percent of the cost, because of that. So I'm going to be kept honest. I've got no stacked decks. I'm sure of that. You know, you're not respected if you're always falling on your knees and kissing somebody else's boots, once in a while you've got to get up and stand up to some people. When they know that this is going to be your attitude then they're going to start working like this and this is what I hope and I think will happen. When this is over, we will sit down like intelligent people, we will look at the problems and so on, and I think that we're more advanced than again, most of the provinces.

To my honourable friend, I say do you know what happens in a Liberal government? In Quebec, for instance, the doctors there, there's three groups. Those that are opting in get paid directly by the government the same as they do here. Some are opting out as a question of principle but they don't extra bill. The patients are paid the full amount and they give it to the doctor. There's a third group who are opting out and who extra bill; the doctor doesn't get a cent and the patient doesn't get a cent. Not one cent. The taxpayer will say, we'll not pay it. I'm not saying this is good but I'm telling you what is happening in other provinces. So I think it is only fair, and if my friend doesn't think that I'm right I want him to tell me now and I want him to tell the public, because I don't think that this is the attitude of his party. I want him to know where I went wrong and should I say yes, we are going to accept the responsibility of you with-drawing service. If that is the case you can't have it both ways. You can't say to a profession, yes, the taxpayer, the citizens - not only the taxpayers, the citizens of this province through legislature will say to you, all right, you license your own group, and that's quite a privilege, then you work on the standard of care that your members should give to the people. You're going to determine that. You're also going to make sure that the ethics of your profession as determined by your own group will be kept up. And then you will also police, inspect, investigate, you will also reprimand, punish, suspend or disbar if you want, and then all of a sudden when they've got all this, they're going to come and say to the government, and there's no agreement except this one agreement, if you won't accept this as full payment, we're going to pay you directly. And you know you've seen what happens since these characters started taking over planes and so on and if you let somebody just threaten you on something you're finished, there's no point in having any government.

So I'm not too concerned, I think that after a certain period we'll sit down like responsible people and we'll be able to come out with certainly, I would hope, a fair and a good schedule of fees and people work together in accepting their responsibilities. I'm sorry I got carried away, I'm covering the waterfront now but I think you led me into this and I don't know if I answered your last question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister says, he kind of opened up a whole new set of questions and I'll adhere to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and not try to cover it all, but I would like to determine from the Minister from his previous remarks relating to the doctors and the position that he now finds himself in in terms of the future planning of medical services in the province, whether he feels that now that the particular issue over the salaries of the doctors in the public employ have been settled - and I tend to agree that perhaps some of the tough talk that was entered into may have had a certain cathartic effect, I would hope it would - but could he indicate now, has he taken any initiative to the Manitoba Medical Association to enter into a continual consultative process for the planning of these things. I wasn't clear from his remarks if he said that he is only dealing with the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons or whether he's going to let the dust settle and let sort of tempers cool and let things sort of work their way out before he takes his initiatives, but could he perhaps indicate without necessarily committing his hand like a good poker player, what he would see happening let's say within the next six months in terms of entering into a more formal relationship with the MMA in terms of this kind of discussion. What does he have in mind as a plan of action in dealing with them to get their involvement in development of these plans?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. DESJARDINS: The College, we want to meet - this was something that was planned before - I want to meet with them more often, talk about the standards and try to increase the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) standard of care. As far as the MMA, there was a contract signed with the Manitoba Health Services Commission and I think that today there was first reading of an Act dealing with the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I think there was a bit of hypocrisy in the past that you had a commission that was supposed to be independent and everybody knew that they had to go to the government because all the money came from the government, it wasn't raising or bringing any money in at all. Now that change will be, except that it will be made quite clear that the policy will be the responsibility of the government. There is certainly room for the commission, some of the things should be taken out of the partisan politics, for instance, when you're looking at where you should build hospitals and so on and one of the tasks, only one, I don't want to mislead and say that the commission will become just an advisory committee, but it will be an advisory committee and it will do certain work as requested by the Minister and so on. So having said that, there is another thing that seemed to be a bit ridiculous to me that the government is paying all the shot and you've got somebody else negotiating. You know, who are you kidding, who are you fooling. So one of the things that we would want to do is get some people that will - I'm talking about the doctors now - who will look at a schedule, who will work with them the same way, and I intend to shortly, at least when I finish these estimates or at the end of the session, to have a good meeting with the MMA and as we say, maybe by then the dust will settle and the people will say, both sides will feel that by getting together we've got more to win and I think this will be done, and talk very seriously with them on the economics. I think that most of the discussion with the MMA will be mostly economics because that's the nature of their organization and so on, so I think that this will be done.

And as far as the, now that we've started again I'm the easiest guy to suck in, now I'm talking about a million other things, but let's talk about negotiating with the hospital people and the nurses and so on. What we'd probably be inclined to do, not bring in legislation but we would have somebody that would sit at the bargaining table as an observer, and there is no doubt that this observer will be taking part in any discussion of the government side or the management side - I mean not while they're speaking to the employees, that observer will keep his mouth shut and see what's going on - but then this is the person that will be able to liaise better with the government and to tell management how far government is ready to go because government must provide the money. I hope that this will work, it's working in certain provinces, because that'll be the first step and if this works you will rely more, you will not take anything away or very little from the board, they will run their own thing. If not, the only alternative that they would have is the government start negotiating directly like they do in certain provinces and so on, and I'm certainly not ready to do that unless it's the only thing left. This is what I think we're inclined to try this year, so there will be more open, frank discussion I think and nobody will be fooled, I hope.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just going to make a few comments over here. I am very pleased at some of the statements that the Minister of Health is making and that he is saying that the doctors will be allowed to have some input possibly into some of the policy making. I would be the first one to agree that policy is the responsibility of government but, if we are going to come up with good policy, with efficient policy, then there'll have to be some input in it from the medical profession. There is just no other way. The medical profession is involved in every program that this particular department is responsible for and doctors will have to be consulted.

Now it seems to me that part of the problem in the recent negotiations came from the fact that the doctors understood, and I believe that the Minister himself made the statement in the House, that there was some agreement between the Department of Health and Social Development and the medical profession that things would be discussed before policy was being implemented. Now apparently this was not the case in the geriatric services review that the government is carrying out. The way I understand it, the doctors were notified four days ahead of time before the policy was announced - is when they received the first inkling of what was happening as far as geriatric services was concerned. Two days after they received this paper, they met with - I don't know, I'm not quite sure who they met with, either with Cabinet or with the Manitoba Health Services Commission - and they were told at that time that this policy already had been approved and that they had had absolutely no input into this particular

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. BROWN cont'd) review. This review deals not only with geriatric services but also substantially with acute bed situations and I think that the doctors were quite put out because they had not been consulted on this whole program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think my honourable friend misunderstood. There's doctors and there's the MMA. I think that what we want, what we're saying, that people that have been trained in a certain way, and it shouldn't be only doctors, there's the paramedical people that have an awful lot to offer also and maybe we should include them once in a while.

Now my honourable friend said that I agreed in the House, admitted, that we had an agreement that we would deal with policies with the MMA. That is not the case. There was a letter signed by my honourable friend when he was Minister of Health, that was a declaration of policy and the things that I read - and I offered to table this letter but everybody told me that they had it - were quite specifically, were talking about those dealing with the economics, and the commitment from the government was, we will not change this without at least letting you know. Okay? That declaration of policy, that's number one. And we will live up to that. Those are the things that, can you opt in or out of the plan, will the Colleges of Physicians police and license, and I say, we want to reinforce those. So there's no problem there. The minute that we want to change this we will discuss with them. But that is not to say that everything that we plan in this field of health that we will give veto to the medical profession. In effect this is what, although they claim they don't want this, is exactly what they would get if we follow the suggestion of my honourable friend.

Let's look at this geriatric. There's not too many experts in this field, geriatricians, in Manitoba, in Canada. Now when we start dealing with this, I had a choice. Go to the medical profession and say, give us somebody to work on that, or try to pick the best brains, the best offer, who might not even be a member of the MMA, and say here, no commitments, you're just committed to do your best, give me your advice. If I ask the MMA, you know what's going to happen. They're going to decide who they're going to send, fine, they know as much as I do, no doubt; this person will not be able - and this is what I said to my honourable friend - they will not be able to make any contribution without going to the executive and then the executive will have to call a general meeting of the 1,200 people, and you think you can plan like that? And you know what's going to happen? The GP's are going to say to hell with you to the specialists, and the rural people will say the hell with you to the city doctors. Because it is a political - they have their political battles like we have in this House. And I say this is impossible. But don't, my honourable friend, ever say or pretend that we haven't discussed with members of the medical profession. We've talked to the best and we've had people that - outsiders, doctors, also, and not members of this party and so on who have been here for months working at the Health Science Centre discussing this with the Dean of the Medical College, with everybody, and this is being done.

Now the only thing I'm saying, and I'll let the MMA be the judge of that, the minute that you can . . . if you want to do something, give us somebody that you choose, but not somebody that's going to go and report to them before they make a contribution to this committee in planning. There is no way that we'll ever do that, give a veto to any group not more than the - well any group. You know, are we doing that with the lawyers? In this agreement the medical profession wanted to make sure that we couldn't get anybody on contract unless they said so. They're free enterprisers, that we respect, that have a patient-doctor relation, are going to tell other people that are employed by a government, or a government, you can't employ anybody. Carry this a little further. You should do that with the lawyers. You should do that with the engineers. You should do that with the accountants. The engineers. There is no way that you can do that. That doesn't mean that I'm against these people when I'm saying . . .

I had a situation, and I'm not faulting anybody, with the Medical Director of Selkirk. Did a hell of a good job in keeping the place open. He's considered management. But because of the set-up, you know you have a trade union that might represent different locales but not one that is considered management and Local so and so will go and vote in the other one. But that same medical director was attending meetings of the MMA where he's clapping and voting for these people to support the closing of the hospital that he's tried to keep open. I'm not faulting him, I'm faulting the system. And this is what I say, when it's realized that we will talk to the medical profession. If it can be done with the MMA fine, I doubt if it can be done, because that

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) is a union that is looking at the economics and they're ready to give full mandate to their executive when it comes to getting more money for them. And I'm not saying this sarcastically, that's the name of the game. But not when it's time to plan.

I wanted to know - we were talking about building a hospital in the north end when I was at the Commission - should they have a Maternity Division and so on. I'm told no, not for a hospital with 100 beds. To consult the committee, I asked the MMA, you know, here's a chance to show that we're working together. We've got a political decision to make and you're the expert in this field, tell us, it'd be a hell of a lot easier if you tell us we can't do it, if we say that the MMA . . . No way, and I'm not blaming them, politically, they couldn't do it. They were afraid to bring it to the association, the president had my letter in his pocket that it was agreed between he and I, I'm not faulting him, if possible I'll pull this letter out at this time, and there was no way, because the GP's want something, the specialists want something else, and they are not ready. And you should see the correspondence that I have. And the specialists want something, as I said with the GPs, and then the rural people are concerned.

So I'm saying that the MMA, the old antenna there is the economics of it all, and there's conflict of interest, there's got to be conflict of interest. And you don't plan where there's conflict of interest. And you don't plan when you're starting to develop something, that you ask a profession or a group. There's no privileged class in society. There shouldn't be. Maybe there are. You don't give anybody a veto to see if it doesn't class with their own feelings and so on. You take an individual - it's the funniest thing, you can have the same fellow with his MMA hat on, can be the most militant guy in the world and then he takes his hat off and becomes Dr. so and so, and he's not even worried about money. And I want to talk to him when he's not worried about money, when I'm talking about planning and the people of Manitoba. That's all I'm saying. And that's all I've said. This is not something new. This is all I've said all along.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we have ever said that the MMA should have the power of veto, we certainly do not agree with that. But if the Minister could have pointed out to us that so and so many months before he made the announcement of the geriatric services review that he sent a study over to the MMA, allowed them to make some kind of an input and then if the Minister would have made his decision, whatever his decision would have been, I do not think that we would have argued the point, because that's the Minister's prerogative. But when he does not consult with these people, when he gives them absolutely no time to have any input into our health care policy then we do become concerned.

Another thing I believe that we are concerned about. We've noticed so many many studies going on within the Province of Manitoba, and we do have very good medical men, is that these studies are done by people who come from outside of the province, who come from outside of Canada, they come from all over the place. Now why can we not utilize the talent that we have within the Province of Manitoba. This is a genuine concern.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . it will be the last time. I want to try to tell my honourable friend about the facts of political life for one thing. I repeat that this was done, and I'll take the example that you selected, not that I did. We had a committee that started on this geriatric committee. There has been a hospital here, a municipal hospital, and I wish my friend would listen because I'm not going to go through this too many times. And I'll try to tell him exactly how it happened without hiding anything. There is a municipal hospital which has been doing great work, it's a free-standing geriatric hospital. There's been a report before, there's been study and most of them if not all of them recommended these geriatric hospitals should be closer to acute beds, where you can get people out of acute beds and get them in geriatric beds and so on.

There is one that was built at St. Boniface. All right. All the commitments - and now I'm going back to my former position as Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission - there was a stack like this of commitments by different governments, including ours, commitments, political commitments to build this municipal hospital. All our advisers and planners were saying that's the biggest mistake in the world. So I got in touch with the Minister and I said, all right, here, you're going to get slapped. Would you authorize me to talk to the board and have one good try of the best brains that we can find to come in and let's see what we can do for the people. No political thing, it might be hard on you and so on. He said, go ahead.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

I met with the board of the municipal hospitals, told them, they were disappointed, they were very fair. The Chairman was very fair. We even had a joint statement to the press that we would make this study. I tried to look for the best people to give us advise on that. Took Dr. Alcock who is the director of this hospital, medical director, who has been working with these people for a long time. Because this hospital was so involved, the Director of this hospital, the Administrator of this hospital was put on this committee. Then I went out to get one of the best, most experienced geriatricians, probably one of the only ones, Dr. Skelton who is director of this hospital in St. Boniface, that's his job, his . . . Then I went out to have another fellow who has nothing to do with this government either, Dr. MacDonald who has been running the Deer Lodge Hospital, this kind of service, for the Federal Government, who's still working for the Federal Government.

Does my friend think this is a pretty good group, these three so far? Could you shake your head one way or another and give me an idea, you know, where I went wrong. This became the committee, and there are three doctors in there. And then, because it was a difficult position, you had a doctor that was the director of a hospital that wanted to build 400 or 500 beds. There was no way that you can put him on the spot or the other doctors, so we got somebody from the Commission to act as chairman, and then we got somebody from the staff of the Commission to say give them all the help they want because they've got to have an answer in six months. Okay. Then there was another doctor, chief consultant at the Commission, Dr. Antles who also became part of this committee.

This committee looked at all the situation of beds and so on of geriatric care. I committed myself that in six months they would have an answer, I didn't know what the answer was, we'd do the best but it would be for the people of Manitoba, the patients of Manitoba, and I said before we did anything that we would meet with the commission and talk to them. I had set up a bed utilization committee for Winnipeg because we had a shortage of beds. The administrator, it's not just the doctors, the doctor's not necessarily the best fellow to know about acute beds and all that, he knows the patient care but don't kid yourself that a doctor is a great administrator, or that all of them are great administrators, you know, there's a limit to what I'll agree with.

All of the administrators of the hospitals in the city, they sat in this committee. The College of Physicians had somebody, the MMA had somebody. They came out - it was very difficult, I guess there is no answer, this was a different study to see what we can do. They came out, there's a shortage of beds, there's a shortage of beds. You know, all right. Well the main thing it was found that it's not a shortage of acute beds, it's a shortage mostly of personal care beds. All right. I said to them, when we have this report of this committee on geriatrics, we will discuss with you on that and they had somebody representing the MMA and so on. So when this report came in, the report in and the work, as I kept in touch with them and so on because the report came in with certain recommendation but there was the former . . . for all the work.

When the government pretty well had an idea of where it was going, I had to very fast, because you understand the political situation, I had to follow my commitment to discuss this before releasing anything with the board of the municipal hospital, with the Bed Utilization Committee. We were talking with Dr. Clarkson and the data study that was working at the Health Science Centre, we had to talk with them because there was an idea that there were too many beds there, that they should close so many, but bring some of those geriatric beds there. I had to touch base with Seven Oaks but that certainly was an improvement, that we were going to have a hospital with only a hundred beds, and now we have a hospital with about 250 beds. I have to check with them. I have to check with St. Boniface Hospital who is going to start kind of a pilot project this time, and I had to check with the Medical College who had to see that there was an orderly transfer of these kind of beds, all at once. And I don't know, I'm sure my friend is not too naive, when you talk to one, ball game's over.

The first thing that the Commission did exactly what they were going to do, it was a Commission - when I say "I", I was Chairman of the Commission at the time. The Commission met with the board, of course they knew what they were recommending and so on but they thought . . . well immediately I got a phone call from the chairman who wanted to talk to me immediately and before even coming to my office, there was a press release and there was an appeal to the people and so on, "Don't let the government do that" and so on, and I had to move.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) So I hastened a press release that I was going to have, I said let's have it sooner. I was chastised because I didn't tell the House first if you remember and I think my honourable friend was invited to this meeting, and then also the commission was instructed to meet immediately with that committee that you were talking about. Now I say to my honourable friend, is there any other way that you can do it without having somebody that's going to try to knock the program or something. You know, you don't give ammunition to the enemy. If somebody, you know that they're going to knock it, then you've got to move fast and I don't think you are that naive. This is all I'm saying. Now, can you tell me that we didn't deal with the people that knew something about it, that we didn't try.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55(a)(2)--The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I don't know if my questions come under this item. I suspect that they do. I got an Order for Return here which I submitted for the . . . how many occasions between January 1st and December 31, 1973, were aircraft leased, loaned or government aircraft used by the Premier and Cabinet Ministers, and who used the aircraft, etc., etc. Well, I'm kind of uptight about the return, for the reasons are quite manifold.--(Interjection)--Certainly. --(Interjection)--I'm referring, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, to a flight that was made by the former Minister of Health and Social Development to Winnipeg, Ottawa and Charlottetown on the 24th of September, 1973, and then another flight from Charlottetown to North Bay on September 26, 1973, and they used an MU2 aircraft and the passengers were Schneider, Edwards, Peters on the flight from Winnipeg to Charlottetown; then Schneider, Edwards, French and Peters with the Minister on the flight from Charlottetown to North Bay. And as you go through this Order for Return, Mr. Chairman, you will find this is the only flight that's been made by this MU2 aircraft for this distance. There is one other flight in this Order for Return where the Minister of Highways went to Saskatchewan - North Battleford - but outside of that, all the flights are within the Province of Manitoba. But this one was made to Charlottetown and the cost to the taxpayers is listed at \$632.70. Now that likely includes, I suppose, all the meals and the accommodation, etc., etc., but I don't see how you can fly an aircraft from Winnipeg to Charlottetown for 632 bucks. And then this flight from Charlottetown to North Bay, I guess they must have drove back from North Bay to Winnipeg, but it says it's 1,700 miles from Charlottetown to North Bay and I can't verify that mileage. I think either the first one's wrong - it's 1,710 miles from Winnipeg to Charlottetown so there's got to be something wrong with the other one, Charlottetown to North Bay. That one apparently is not correct. And the figures are . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I think that that question would be perhaps best asked under the Minister's salary.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . there was an Order for Return on this . . . more details. --(Interjection)--No, you're talking about - not this year.

MR. McKENZIE: I got it on the 3rd of April, 1975. It was returned . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, that's all departments. But there is one specifically on the same thing for the Department of Health and that should be tabled in this House any day now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I mean this is not under the item that's under discussion. If you have an item dealing with something of that nature, I think it should be raised under the Minister's salary. Now while I'm on the point, I think I might also say that the debate is becoming repetitious on one thing. Now I think you've either got to . . . You've wandered all over the globe here. Now we're under Administrative Salaries under Executive Function, and I think that the questions should be pertinent to that.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I do submit, and very humbly, that this would be an executive function where the Minister was using his . . . to go to Charlottetown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister's salary is not under discussion at this time. Now the honourable member knows that on the Minister's salary, the Minister makes his introductory remarks. We don't discuss the Minister's salary until the last item. That is the way that we have been operating. Now I wish that the honourable member would not persist. I think that if he wants to bring the item up that he's talking about now, bring it up at the end when we're on the Minister's salary.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have made a ruling and I'm not going to sit and argue with the honourable members about it.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, then I raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

MR. ENNS: My point of order is that the particular item brought to your attention by the Member for Roblin is, I admit, not one that falls into the general ambit of some of the headings in the department, Welfare Advisory Committee, Resources Division, Statistics Branch, something like that. It obviously deals with the proper heading Executive Function that we're dealing with. We're not dealing with the Minister's Salary. He is not specifically referring to the Minister's aspect of this but we're talking about . . . we have such innocuous items as Other Expenditures, Salaries, and these certainly, one would assume that it is not the rank and file of the department that fly in chartered aircrafts and fly around this country in chartered aircrafts, but it is relegated to the senior executive members of the department under the Executive Function that we're now dealing with in its broadest scope.

Now I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, that we're not dealing in the whole waterfront of the department that we normally take in when we discuss the Minister's salary, but I would ask you, then, for some direction for myself and for the Member for Roblin, to indicate to us under which specific heading, if we want to be specific - and he is being very specific; he is talking about executive members of the department chartering aircraft to fly to different parts of this country, and it is executives of the department that are doing it - under which specific heading, as we go heading by heading, should we raise that matter and should we get some answers to the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would respectfully submit that maybe you should allow discussion at this time, because if I was to be asked to point out under what item this should be discussed, I think that this is the place because we're talking about the expense and so on. My reason for rising earlier, I thought that my honourable friend was referring to an old Order that he had, because I know that there was something, a question asked in this House that was accepted not too long ago, and that hasn't been filed yet. But if he has some other information, if this was asked, I think this is the place to discuss it and with your permission I'd like to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Salaries. Salaries, to my way of thinking, do not include expenditures. Now if the honourable member wants to raise it under (3) that's fine and dandy, but (2) is Salaries and salaries is what we're going to stick on. 55(a)(2)--passed; 55(a)(3)--

MR. MCKENZIE: I apologize for being out of order. I thought we were on (3) and I apologize for speaking out of turn.

I think the question, this Order for Return, first of all how come that this is the first time the MU2 aircraft was flown that great distance, 1,710 miles? And, of course, the reason for the mission, I think, deserves an answer. In these figures that's given, the fixed cost is \$376.20 and the variable cost on the flight from Winnipeg to Charlottetown is \$256.50. The total is \$632.70. Now are the costs of that flight charged back to the Minister's department? That's one question. Why they used the charter? And the other one: What is the rate per mile of the aircraft that's charged back to the department on that flight?

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . the same question, I will not endeavour to read it now because this was asked in the House and this will be filed in the House with the information and the total costs. Now as far as why was this the first trip, I suppose because they just bought the plane. It was new. Somebody had to have the first trip. I don't think that that's too important.

Now, why was the plane used to go outside of Manitoba? I would say that this was a ministerial decision. I don't know really why. There's a possibility that they wanted to have so many people - they might have stopped to visit some hospital or something. I don't know, and I can't answer for the Minister, but as far as I'm concerned this is something that can be done. When I was Minister of Tourism, I've used the plane to go up North and so on, to go into different areas. I know that some people in the staff, the years previous to that, took the plane to go to the States to do certain work. It was a little costly. When all the facts are known, it might be that it was justified and in fact that there might have been a saving of money, but this was the Minister of the day made a decision that he had a right to make, and that is about all I can say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that implicit in the questioning of this item by the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. ENNS cont'd) Honourable Member for Roblin of course is the question of, you know, when senior members and the Minister travel to places, you know, major centres of our country, why not use the regular carriers like Air Canada? And the only question would be one of comparison cost. What was the cost comparison had the mission travelled with Air Canada, for instance, or CP Air, as compared to private charter? That's a question. Now, you know, we're dealing with a department that spends \$300 million per annum, and somewhere along the line of course one would also like to believe that economy and concern for the dollars is expressed, particularly in a department like this, right at the top, right at the Minister's level, right out of his office.

So I think the Honourable Minister could resolve this question and we could get on with the more important aspects of the department very quickly if he gave us some indication that, is this a practice that he intends to pursue during his tenureship of office? Is their savings to the public purse by the use of this aircraft as compared to regular carriers such as Air Canada? And, you know, I think we can all accept, indeed that's why we build up our own government air services craft, when it's a question of flying up to isolated communities, to flying up to visit some northern locations where regular air service is not always available or if it's not conveniently available. But, sir, when you're flying or when you're going to a major centre in Canada such as Charlottetown, which surely has to rank next with Toronto and Montreal, then, you know, one has to question why not use our own government carrier, namely Air Canada?

But again, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong it and I think specifically, and in deference to the people of Charlottetown, the question should be asked: Was this a junket on the part of the former Minister and was he taking his friends along for a little ride where he could pop in and out of different places, you know, stop at some roadhouses or what have you on the way down, or was it in fact, you know, a money-saving venture on the part of the then Minister of Health and Social Development? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, let me say, first of all, that this Order for Return was accepted by myself on March 17th and I know that we have the information now - I saw it yesterday; it's being prepared in the right form, and I hope that you'll have it in a day or so. So all the information will be given.

Now some of the questions, you know, what am I going to do? Well, first of all, I think the question was . . . Personally I'm afraid of those little planes; I'm much better in a large plane, so if we can get a 747 I'll go on a 747. I don't like these little planes. I think that it was obvious that--(Interjection)--I'm going on a diet.

MR. MILLER: It won't take off. I can go on a single-engine.

MR. DESJARDINS: You can go on a pigeon, never mind a single engine.

I would say that at times, you know, there is no doubt that the cost of this plane is more than a single fare, return fare, on Air Canada. It depends how many people were on that plane, for one thing. It depends on the stops that it has made. If they gain a few days by stopping and doing their business in certain areas where they didn't have to rent rooms, that I don't know - I'm not suggesting this is the case but this is something when the Order for Return would come, I would suggest that that could be discussed, and I guess that the Minister can, unless he feels that he wants to say something at this time. But I can't say any more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to make a long speech. I don't have the habit of standing up in the process of estimates of one of my colleagues, but I was the Minister of Health and Social Development at that time. Circumstances surrounding the decision by myself to use the MU2 to go to Charlottetown for a conference of Ministers - there were some stopovers; the plane was full. I believe there were seven passengers on the plane. The cost comparison was made prior to departure as compared with Air Canada and CP Air, and there was the cost of accommodation that would have had to be taken into consideration that was actually discussed prior to booking the MU2. I personally have not renewed the practice of taking the MU2 out of the province since. I have in many cases taken it within the province. I know of some of my colleagues that have taken it out of province since we've had the lease on the MU2. I think my decision was based on, first of all, (1) cost; (2) time constraints - I had to be back in Winnipeg with some of my what I consider to be important officials, back at a certain time. I was not the only Minister there with the Government Air Service plane. I was

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . one of four, and not the furthest either. Alberta was there with its private plane, and there were three other provinces involved in having their own plane, and I believe that their decision was based on the same as mine, being time constraint, costs, and practice equally in regards to . . . I, myself, cannot fly in a small plane. I become ill. I can fly on a big plane as the schedule can be accommodated, but in that case it couldn't. But I haven't made a practice of using the MU2 or any other plane under Government Air Service to fly out of province since.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, and the Honourable Minister - I thank him for the information, but the reason that I raised the question was because this was the first time the MU2 flew that distance. The one other flight was North Battleford. Then there's got to be something wrong with the mileage here because it's 1,710 miles from Winnipeg to Charlottetown. I buy that, but then on the return flight from Charlottetown to North Bay it's 1,700 miles and it doesn't say that the Minister came back to Winnipeg. The flight was terminated in North Bay and it's still 1,700 miles from North Bay to Charlottetown. That's what it says in the Return. So if that's the reasons that the figures are so out-of-date, they're not fresh, something is wrong with the figures that were given. There's other areas in the Return but it's another department. But there's something wrong with the figures; and I would hope the Minister would take it in good faith, that's the reason I raised it because it's so obvious. That's the first flight in that Order for Return outside of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the mileage is not correct.

MR. DESJARDINS: There's a mistake there and we'll have the figures checked. I thank the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not so sure that this matter is something that should be left alone. Not at all.--(Interjection)--I just wonder, really, at this point whether the presentation that has been given to us is accurate or not. You know, the Order for Return dealing with the mileage is inaccurate. The explanation given by the Minister is that it was easier to go by the MU2, and I don't know its length of range before it has to refill. It was to meet certain time constraints that the Minister has talked about, but my understanding of Air Canada's schedule is that it operates daily through the major centres in Canada, and there are possibilities of being able to make connections. I don't know what costs we're talking about but we're talking about a cost which is chargeable to the public purse, a cost that is borne by the public in the discharge of responsibilities of the Minister, and I think that there is a question that has to be raised as to concern for the administration with respect to attitude in spending public money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. DESJARDINS: On March 17th, the following Order was--(Interjection)--Just a minute please - the breakdown of individual expenses for each member of the government delegation which attended the Provincial Ministers of Health Conference held in Charlottetown, September 24-26, 1973. And I would like to suggest to my honourable friend that I'm committing myself this time to have this answer next week while my estimates are still going. I wonder if we could wait till we get the proper figures, if anything, before we argue on this. I will make a commitment to have this answer while my estimates are still going on.

MR. SPIVAK: Then if the Minister is going to undertake that we will have this file with us so that we'll be able to deal with it even if we deal with it under his estimates, under his ministerial salary, then that's agreed, that's fine, and I would assume that the breakdown will deal with the obvious error as well, with respect to--(Interjection)--Well it has to dovetail with the information supplied because it's obvious that there has been an error made in the first Order of Return filed - not by the Minister, but one section of the government dealing with the mileage involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55(a)(3)--The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we have an item here of \$82,200. I wonder if the Minister could give us a bit of a breakdown on this.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, this covers wages and other assistance; professional fees, other fees; furniture and office equipment rentals; printing and stationery supplies; postage; telephone and telegraph equipment; automobile mileage charged and accessories; advertising exhibits; publications; freight; express and cartage; travelling; miscellaneous not

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) classified elsewhere; educational assistance; grants to hospitality; Provincial Ministers Welfare Conference; Health and Social Development Advisory Council; for new Minister's office - which was nothing. No, there's nothing for that. That's to come.

So is that the information to satisfy my . . . Would you want an item for . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(3)--passed; (b)(1)--passed; (b)(2)--The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, there's not much time left and I think there are some fairly important issues under this area that I perhaps could begin to raise with the Minister. In this item under the Welfare Advisory Board, the issue that has been really, as far as I can understand it, still of some dispute between the City of Winnipeg and the provincial department in which the Welfare Advisory Board has found itself having to intervene on several occasions, is dealing with the application of the property tax rebate to welfare recipients, and where municipalities in the province have attempted to work out schemes where municipal welfare assistance would be reduced in like amount to the rebate system that would go on, and that the Welfare Advisory Board I think over the past year or two has been forced to publicly intervene in some of these issues in order to try and clarify, and I would wonder if the Minister at this time would indicate whether the government has sat down with the municipalities and worked out a system whereby there would be no particular restriction or penalty imposed upon welfare assistance, which is cost-shared in part by the Provincial Government, to the municipalities in relation to the rebate system.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say at this time that we're not satisfied with the situation the way it is now. I think that the Advisory Committee has done its work properly. It's made certain recommendations to us. It was a little late in coming. It might result in a change in legislation and this is something that will be studied, the whole situation, because there is an awful lot more problems than my honourable friend - and I am sure that he knows that - has suggested, and of course a lot depends on what's going to happen in Ottawa on this thing. But in the coming months, after the session ends, this will be looked at and I think there will be major changes in this.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to hear the Minister's answer. I'm wondering if he could indicate, in the short term, particularly in terms of procedures to be carried out in the next year or within the next several months with the new rebate system and cost of living rebate that has been administered, what will be the exact position in relation to the municipalities? Has that situation been clarified? Has some understanding been reached with the municipalities as to how this particular sum of money should be passed on, and do they all understand very well that it is not necessarily to be penalized or to be reduced from the amount?

MR. DESJARDINS: The problem there is we're limited in what we can do. As my honourable friend knows, this was passed on by the government to the municipalities, to the individual municipalities, and what they've done hasn't always pleased us and this is one of the main issues that I want to look into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions to the Honourable Minister under the Welfare Advisory Committee, and of course it looks here like there's been a reduction of some \$23,000 to the philosophy of the Welfare Advisory Committee, and I'm wondering now if the Minister is considering using some volunteer services or is he considering now to use some of the municipal advice that's available in the country for information on that particular subject matter? Because this has been a longstanding quarrel in the country, that the municipal people have, over the years, been left without their resources in some of the committee meetings that have been held by the Welfare Advisory Committee in the areas, and some meetings, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, they have been considered. And of course it goes back, Mr. Chairman, to the whole philosophy of the welfare system, and that is of course, are the right people being helped? This is the one that historically keeps coming up all the time when we deal, and the Welfare Advisory Committee have done a reasonably good job. I have sat in with them on occasion. But I wonder now, is the Minister reshaping the welfare structure under this Advisory Committee, or what is the reason for the large cut in expenditures that we see under this item?

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, Private Members' Hour . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: It's my understanding that the Minister will not be available Monday to continue estimates. I wonder if he could give us some indication as to what the particular order will be, whether we'll continue with Corrections and Rehabilitation or whether there will be another estimates being considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is possible that we may continue Health and Social Development Estimates, which means that the Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation may be on. On the other hand, we're just checking now, it's possible that we will go into Capital Supply.

. continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Walding): Order please. The meeting will come to order. I direct the attention of honourable members to Page 29 in their Estimates book. Resolution 64(a)(1). The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I believe it's under the Motor Vehicle Branch that most of the Highways Traffic Act comes into force, and I'd like to ask the Minister how many amendments to the Highway Traffic Act have been passed by the Legislature and not proclaimed and are not in effect in the province today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: My guess is that it's about six.

MR. GRAHAM: Do we have any indication of what those sections are and why they have not been proclaimed?

MR. USKIW: Not at this point in time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The question I would like to ask deals with the licensing of those farmers who do custom harvesting in the States. I understand this year that the Motor Vehicle Branch are going to be compelling these people to buy a truck licence rather than the ordinary farm licence which they have been using in the past. I wonder if the Minister could explain the rationale for asking these people who, in my view, in that process of going down to the States and earning money, come back here and pay a considerable amount to the government in the form of taxes, both revenue tax and income taxes, why they must be levied this additional charge of having to buy a truck licence rather than going down there with farm licences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brako.

MR. JOE BRAKO: It's a matter of coinciding with the classed system of driver licences throughout the Dominion of Canada and the United States.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the Minister could explain just exactly what that means. I'm afraid that he's lost me somewhere along the way.

MR. BRAKO: I've just been informed that you're talking about a licence plate rather than a driver's licence.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, a licence plate. That's right.

MR. BRAKO: Under the Highway Traffic Act, the farmer's plate cannot be used for commercial purposes, and this will also then, of course, tie in to your class of licence which you will be getting depending on what category the truck the farmer is driving enters into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, that still does not satisfy me. I wonder if he can explain the reason for it. I'm not sure that this whole thing is justified nor is it equitable. First of all, the farmer leaves here to go down to the States, and the only period of time that he uses that particular truck on the highway - and one assumes that the purpose of these licences is to ensure that the user is going to pay a share of highway construction and maintenance - the only time those trucks are used is from the time they leave the farmer's yard until they get to the border. That is the only time they are used in Manitoba. From there on they're in United States country and they're charged every state they go through. Every state they go through, whether they do any harvesting there or not, they are charged a levy of about 30 to - it varies from about \$30.00 to about \$80.00 for these trucks to move through the state in which they are going. For example, to do down to Oklahoma they go through North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and then Oklahoma. So that in five separate states they're being charged, and that's understandable because they're using the highways down there and on the way back they'll be using the roads to haul the grain and to haul the machines. But why in Canada?

Now, they understand that it's perfectly justified to increase their insurance rates because the liability, as was explained by Mr. Dutton here the other day, the liability is greater and the awards down in the States are much higher. So they are perfectly prepared to pay the additional insurance rates in keeping with the responsibilities and the liabilities. But why the licence? You know, I'm beginning to wonder if governments are acting more like pirates and highwaymen than they are like governments. I can see no justification whatsoever for the additional charge of about \$230 for a farmer who lives, for example, along the border. Let's take the case of a farmer at Holbstadt who has three miles to go before you get to the border. That's the only time that he uses Canadian roads and Canadian territory, and yet he has to pay about \$230, and then as soon as he gets into North Dakota then there's another \$30.00. When he gets to the next state then he pays some more, and so on until he gets down to where he is

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) going to start harvesting. You know, the Sheriff of Nottingham didn't have near as much trouble as these people have, and Robin Hood was a piker, you know, compared to what we have in the form of legitimate governments today. And I just can't understand why they must be charged an additional \$250 for that kind of a licence plate when in fact he is not going to be operating in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, in response to the member's question. There was an amendment passed in 1972, I believe - it could have been in 1971 but I think it was in 1972 - to the Highway Traffic Act with respect to the use of farm truck plates. Up to that point there really was no legislation whatsoever governing the use of farm truck plates and there was a great number of complaints from people about the abuses of farm truck plates. Now one of the principles that were enacted was that the use of vehicles, trucks, registered as farm trucks, that such trucks could not be used in any commercial enterprise where the person is receiving compensation other than in connection with his own farming and . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: May I interject at this point and ask if that applies in the Province of Manitoba or if it applies in the United States as well?

MR. DYGALA: Well, let me finish that. I'll come to that part of the question. So that as matters now stand, any truck that has farm truck plates on it can only be used in connection with that person's farming operation. He can haul whatever goods to market or from, for his own purposes or uses on his own farm, and for his own personal transportation as well. Now when you get into a commercial enterprise, which is what this is, then the person will have to obtain a commercial truck plate, a CT plate. Now Manitoba does have currently reciprocity arrangements with some of the states. Where a commercial truck plate is issued with extra provincial authority, or reciprocity authority, then the reciprocating state would not impose an additional levy. Now in the United States at the moment, there is a new plan that has been devised and is being implemented, known as the International Registration Plan. Under that scheme of registration - and this is principally having to do with commercial truck vehicles - every state, the home state, would impose a registration fee according to the fee payable to that state, and that state in turn would remit to the other state a proportion of that fee, depending on the miles travelled in the other jurisdiction. Now Manitoba at the present time is considering that particular plan. There's been no decisions made with respect to whether we go into it or not. There's also ramifications. But as matters now stand, Mr. Chairman, any farmer who is engaged in these kinds of operation and has a farm truck plate on his vehicle, could not use it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well does that mean . . . does this new arrangement mean that when they go down to the States now, if they have a truck plate, a commercial truck plate, that they will not be charged these additional levies that they've been charged in the past going through those states?

MR. DYGALA: Only in those states, Mr. Chairman, with which Manitoba has an existing reciprocity agreement. I can't give you the list at the moment, Mr. Chairman. I know we have a reciprocity agreement with North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska - I'm not sure about Kansas; Texas yes; Oklahoma, I'm not certain about.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if you - maybe not at the moment - but I wonder if you could undertake to supply us with that list.

MR. DYGALA: Yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: A further question then. What happens when the farmer comes back? Now he is equipped with CT plates that prevents him from hauling his own produce.

MR. DYGALA: No it does not. The commercial truck plate - when he completes his swing through the States, completes his harvesting operation, what he really should do is simply turn those plates, CT plates, in and apply for refund on the unexpired portion and concurrently apply for farm truck plates, and he will be credited the amount owing to him with respect to the CT plates so that in effect he will be paying for the commercial truck plates only for that part of the number of months that he is actually using them. He doesn't have to pay for the full year.

MR. JORGENSEN: So, just to recap - I want to make sure I understand this now. The commercial truck plates are issued to conform with agreements that you have with states in the

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) United States so that this additional levy that they had been charging in the past will not now be charged.

MR. DYGALA: Not by those states with whom . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . but which you have agreements.

MR. DYGALA: Right. By, of course, those states with whom we do not have . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes. And that when they return, they just have to return the plate and get the refund on the unexpired portion of that commercial truck plate.

MR. DYGALA: One further point for clarification, Mr. Chairman, that I omitted to mention, and that is that some of the states, South Dakota being one of them, that had written to us threatening to cancel the reciprocity agreement, they haven't exercised this yet but they may. Similarly, some of the other states that have joined this International Registration Plan propose to ultimately cancel out or withdraw from all the reciprocity agreements that they have with other states or provinces.

MR. JORGENSEN: Is there an explanation for that?

MR. DYGALA: Well the explanation is simply that they feel that they don't want to operate under two different plans, one the old reciprocity agreement, and one the International Registration Plan, under which the truckers pays a registration fee to his home jurisdiction and that fee is then apportioned to all the various states or provinces in which he travels, based on miles travelled in that particular jurisdiction.

MR. JORGENSEN: I see. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister what, if any, commission does the Motor Vehicle Branch or the Department of Highways receive for collecting premiums from Autopac?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, there are no commissions payable by Autopac to the Motor Vehicle Branch. There is a commission payable to agents and that comes out from the registration fee.

MR. BANMAN: Do I understand correctly then that there is not charge by the Motor Vehicle Branch to Autopac for the collection of premiums?

MR. DYGALA: Well, there are two parts to that, or two answers to that question. Firstly, with respect to motor vehicle registration, the MPIC are responsible for operating that system, that is the computer system and all the processing of all the paper work and so on. And the Motor Vehicle Branch compensates the Insurance Corporation based on the real costs that they've incurred in connection with that operation. On the driver licence side, the Motor Vehicle Branch operates that system and there is a recovery from MPIC, again based on actual costs.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, according to the statement that we have, we have the share of driver's licensing administration paid by Autopac last year was \$165,000. Would that represent the amount as far as demerit points and the collection of the \$15.00 fee on driver's licence? Would that be the administration costs of that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I believe the honourable member is discussing something that would be better covered under part (b) Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration. We're currently on Resolution 64(a)(1) Management Services, Salaries.

MR. BANMAN: Fine. I'll discuss it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Part of my question has been answered, Mr. Chairman, division of responsibility, and Mr. Dygala just answered that. You know, I'm interested in knowing the number of suspended drivers at the present time but I don't know what that comes under. Licence Suspension Appeal Board, or where does that . . .? Safety? Under Safety(c)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm advised that would come under section (b).

MR. McKELLAR: Okay.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister: If there has been a change in the total number of management personnel in the last four years, and if there has been a reduction, did those people go to MPIC? Or has the management staff of the Motor Vehicle Branch remained constant over the last four or five years?

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: I'm advised that there was a very substantial drop in SMY's in this particular area, which has been taken up by MPIC.

MR. GRAHAM: Were all those people . . . did they have an option on the transfer?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: They were able to choose whether they stayed with the Motor Vehicle Branch or swung over?

MR. USKIW: I'm advised that they have a continuing option should they wish to transfer back to the Civil Service system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(a)(1) - passed. (2)-passed. (a)-passed. Resolution 64(b)(1). The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To pursue the line of questioning that I was trying to do before. I wonder - I'm just trying to establish the roles of the Motor Vehicle Branch and the roles of MPIC and how they work - the Motor Vehicle Branch collects the premiums on automobiles when they're registered either through the government agency or by mail or that type of thing, eh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of MPIC.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the vehicle registrations when they are renewed, whether they be by mail, come directly to 330 Portage Avenue, to the present administrative offices of MPIC. If there's counter renewals made for vehicle registrations they can be made at an agent or at the Motor Vehicle Branch. The staff at the counter are staff of MPIC working with in the Motor Vehicle Branch, and the administration of the computer, as mentioned by the Registrar, computer facilities and the administration of vehicle registration, is under the jurisdiction of MPIC. However, under law, the full administration for drivers is under the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that when I walk into the Motor Vehicle Branch now and I buy licence plates for a car and I also buy Autopac, that the person that is serving me at the counter at that time is an employee of the MPIC?

MR. DYGALA: That's right. That's correct.

MR. URUSKI: However, should you renew your driver's licence at the other side of that same area, the people renewing driver's licences are employees of the Motor Vehicle Branch.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if I could ask the Minister then, checking back in the Estimates over the years I've noticed that this particular section of the Estimates has increased rather dramatically with regards to driver's licensing and vehicle registration both in - mainly in other . . . Well, we're talking about other expenditure, but I wonder - the whole driver's licensing and vehicle registration has increased, I think quite substantially, over the last number of years and I wonder if the Minister could just elaborate on the basic reason for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the actual expenditures on the licensing and registration system has actually been reduced, and the other item you're dealing with has to do with licence plates, which is an increase. That reflects the new plates that were tabled here - is that right? - for next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of MPIC.

MR. URUSKI: Any increases in actual administrative costs would be the increase in driver transactions and motor vehicle transactions, which would reflect in the costs one way or the other from MPIC or vice versa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: There's a \$1.250 million increase for licence plates.

MR. URUSKI: Those are the new plates.

MR. USKIW: The new plates cost that?

MR. BANMAN: Actually we're discussing (b)(2) then. That would be under (b)(2) item.

MR. USKIW: That's correct.

MR. BANMAN: And the majority of that would be for the new licence plates being issued this year.

MR. USKIW: In 1976.

MR. BANMAN: And you say that is how much?

MR. USKIW: \$1.250 million is the additional amount.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, this is regarding the question I was asking before: the number of suspended drivers, and also the number that are suspended for life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, the most current figure that I have is 24,000 - some-odd hundred drivers that are suspended for a variety of causes. As to the number of those that are suspended for life for whatever reason, I don't have an exact figure. It's just a figure that I recollect and I'm not sure how current it is, it's something in the area of about 800.

MR. McKELLAR: One of the problems in most every community is the suspended drivers continuously going out on the road, and everyone knows the chance you take when you crash into one of these, because they have no insurance. You're just out of luck. What type of controls, or is there some way of watching over these? Do the RCMP do a job on these men or what is done to keep these people off the road, if anything?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, one of the methods used is . . . Well, there are two methods. First of all, to give the police as up-to-date information as we possibly can on all licensed drivers or those who are suspended, they have direct access to the computer. That is, if they stop a driver and he's not able to produce a driver's licence, they can instantly check with the system and they can verify whether he has a licence and simply doesn't have it on him, or whether he's suspended. In addition to that, we print a monthly list of all suspended drivers that is furnished to all the police forces, all the agents who are authorized to issue driver's licences, and of course our branch offices as well, as a means of stopping these people from getting a licence.

MR. McKELLAR: One other question. If a suspended driver is caught driving by the police, what are the penalties at the present time? Are they a jail term, fine, or what penalties are handed out to these men?

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, it varies greatly. The minimum fine usually is around \$50.00. That is sometimes imposed where there are extenuating circumstances. I think the average fine, if there is such a thing, runs around \$200.00. There's rarely a jail term imposed for the first offence, sometimes for the second, and I think almost invariably for the third.

MR. McKELLAR: One other question regarding a person suspended for impaired driving, third offence of impaired driving. Is there any way that man can get a temporary licence? Like if he was a farmer, say, can he get a temporary licence daylight hours or . . . ?

MR. DYGALA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, he can. Upon conviction, all he has to do is simply ask the court, or tell the court that he needs a licence connected with his work, whatever that is, whether he's a farmer or otherwise engaged in employment that requires a driver's licence. He then has to appeal to the Appeal Board for a final decision whether he's going to get a licence, because the licence issued by the Board is only valid for 45 days. If he has two previous convictions for the same offence, his chances of getting a licence obviously are going to be pretty slim, but they can still get it and the odd time they do.

MR. McKELLAR: Is it necessary for them to join Alcoholics Anonymous, or what protection does the public have? I'm just trying to clarify it.

MR. DYGALA: For many years now - I can't quite remember when we began this program, it was in the early Sixties - and based on research done both here and elsewhere, it was found that a very substantial number of drivers who are convicted for second offence indeed have a drinking problem, more or less acute. We then attempt to try to get the assistance and co-operation of psychiatrists to evaluate whether indeed they had a drinking problem or not. We didn't enjoy a great deal of success in that area. We finally approached the Manitoba Alcoholism Foundation for assistance and they've been extremely helpful.

Now, when a person is convicted of a second offence, he is asked to furnish a certificate either from the Manitoba Alcohol Foundation or a psychiatrist - he is given that choice - to certify that he is not an alcoholic. If he is, well then no licence is issued until such time as he has maintained his sobriety for a sufficient period of time that you can at least take the chance of putting him back on the road. And as the Minister in his remarks yesterday mentioned, we - again in co-operation with the Manitoba Alcoholism Foundation - developed a program for rehabilitation of these people. There's not much point in suspending and keeping these people suspended if their problem is drinking. That doesn't cure the problem, unfortunately. Such

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. DYGALA cont'd) programs have been initiated in other jurisdictions and there are various conflicting reports as to their success, but we're attempting the program here.

MR. McKELLAR: One final question, Mr. Chairman. Do you have a set policy for elderly persons when they reach a certain age regarding getting a driver's licence regarding medical? I have some people in my area and around 80 years of age they have to go to get a medical and pass a driver's test. Is that a standard policy in the Branch, the Motor Vehicle Branch? How do you . . . ? --(Interjection)-- It won't be long. I'm getting very close to it.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, the current policy is that where a driver is involved in either an accident, where there is some evidence that he may have been at fault, or he is convicted of an offence and he's over 65, then a test or a medical request may be asked for. For a while we were asking all drivers over 75 to file a medical report regardless of whether he has an accident or not.

MR. McKELLAR: Seventy-five years of age.

MR. DYGALA: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we're dealing with the medical reports, if the Department requires or requests a medical report on any individual, is the Department prepared to pay for the cost of that medical report?

MR. USKIW: No, apparently not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Why not?

MR. USKIW: The costs of the medical report relate to the securing of a position, a job, and therefore it is in the interests of the individual to have a special medical done for that purpose. It is taken from that that the public should not have to subsidize the interests of someone's employment or other. Medicare and Hospitals Services apply in cases where people suffer from illness and so on, but certainly not for the purposes of satisfying an employing agency as to the health of the individual. According to the information provided, everyone is entitled to one free medical per year.

MR. GRAHAM: Everybody is entitled to one free medical, yes. But when anyone asks for a medical report, the doctor then charges the individual \$10.00, \$15.00, or whatever it is, he charges for that report. Now if the Department requests that form be filled out, even though the man has complied and has had a medical, it's the Department that requires the report. Why should the Department not pay for the report?

MR. USKIW: The point is that it's in the interest of the applicant for a licence that that report is required. It's not in the interest of the Department.

MR. GRAHAM: No, but it is the Department that is asking for it.

MR. USKIW: Yes, to prove . . . Well, the problem of medical fitness is part of our safety precautionary measures that are undertaken.

MR. GRAHAM: No, but if the man has had a medical report, all the Department has to do is pick up the phone and phone the doctor and ask if he's had a medical, and he can get the same results there. But somehow through this bureaucracy we have built, we have to have it on paper and probably in duplicate or triplicate.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we've stated our position on that. It would be subsidization of some degree if Medicare or hospitalization programs were to cover this kind of inspection requirement, or requirement to report on medical fitness.

MR. GRAHAM: No, but it's just one arm of government asking another arm of government to do something.

MR. USKIW: Well that is correct, excepting it's in the interest of the individual who is applying for a service from the government that this is being done.

MR. GRAHAM: In other words, it's a penalty on the individual.

MR. USKIW: No, it's not a penalty, Mr. Chairman. I have to argue with my friend from Birtle-Russell. The fact is that it's in the interests of the individual and it's in the interests of the total community that we try to maintain some standard so that people that are on the highway are reasonably expected to perform without handicap or whatever.

MR. GRAHAM: Then, Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question? If a person submits a medical report as required, and the Department then asks for another one and maybe another one after that, will the Department then pay for the second and third medical reports if required?

MR. USKIW: There has never been a provision to cover that kind of eventuality, Mr. Chairman.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. GRAHAM: Can I then ask why more than one medical report is required?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is assuming that more than one is required.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not assuming anything, I'm asking a straight question. Why is more than one medical report required in certain cases?

MR. USKIW: Well, I would presume that that would only flow from the first report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, a second medical report is occasionally requested and is usually, and almost invariably, at the recommendation of the initial doctor reporting, where he's recommended that a second medical opinion is obtained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. Mr. Dygala, did I take it from your statement that a person over 75 years old it was mandatory that they had a certificate, a health certificate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would all honourable members address their questions to the Minister, not to one of the staff. Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, no, it's not mandatory in the sense that there's nothing in the statute that says everybody over 75 has to file a medical report. Even under the class licence, providing the person holds a Class 5 licence, there are medical standards established in the regulations but there's not requirement. It's been a policy of the department to require drivers of that age to file a medical report.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, getting back to these medical reports, I understand that there are certain age categories that have been established and if you're under a certain age you require a medical report every five years; if you're in another age bracket it's every three years, and diminishing as the age increases. Is this part of the so-called government ability-to-pay principle, that they figure the older a person is the better enabled he is to pay, or just what is the criteria for establishing that?

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, the medical standards that were adopted in Manitoba were developed at the request of the National Driver Licence Committee for all provinces in connection with the class licence system which was adopted by all provinces - not yet implemented but adopted. British Columbia and Alberta have implemented the class licence system. So these are national standards. Indeed, Alberta took the position that with respect to Classes 1 and 2 licences that their drivers are required to file a medical report annually - every year, not once every five years. The Canadian Medical Association, that studied this problem for nearly two years, concluded that up to age 45 a medical report once every five years would be sufficient, that from 45 to age 65 a medical report every two years would be adequate, and from there on once a year. And this is based on the probability of a person developing a condition at those ages that would be harmful or dangerous for that person to operate vehicles in certain classes.

MR. GRAHAM: It has nothing to do with the ability-to-pay doctrine that the present government has adopted.

MR. USKIW: We haven't yet moved in the area of licensing on the basis of ability-to-pay. One is presumed to have the ability-to-pay if one is presumed to have the ownership of a vehicle, to say the least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions I'd like to ask regarding that proposed testing program that will be carried out with regard to the various classifications of driver's licence, and I suspect this is the section that we deal with this. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The testing of drivers or the testing of vehicles?

MR. GRAHAM: The testing of drivers. The various classifications of driver's licences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comes under Safety, item (c) under this resolution. Resolution 64(b) (1)--passed. (2)--passed. (b)--passed. Resolution 64(c). The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, we're now embarking on a program of driver licence classifications and I would like to know if drivers will be able to obtain their various classifications under the existing offices that now occur for driving testing in the Province of Manitoba. Or will there be changes made and certain classes can only be taken at certain locations?

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, for Class 5 licences, which is the ordinary driver's licence, the answer is yes they can take the test at any location where we now test drivers. For Classes 1 and 2, however, there are some communities where you simply cannot administer an adequate test, and for that reason the test for those two classes of licence will be administered at larger community centres. However, they have been so selected that no one is going to have to travel very far to take his road test.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I live close to Russell, Manitoba. How far would I have to travel to take a test for Class 1, Class 2, Class 3, Class 4, Class 5, etc?

MR. DYGALA: Well Class 5, 4 and 3 will be administered there. I'm not sure about Class 2. I'd have to check that. I think we will be administering tests at Russell for Classes 1 and 2 but I'm not absolutely certain of that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Another thing - and I'll use my own case as an example, Mr. Chairman. To adequately cover my own farm operations, I believe I would have to have Class 1 licence. I have no five-axle trucks but there are times when we do load grain into a semi and we have a very good arrangement with a local transfer. He'll leave his truck there, we fill it up and we take it up to his yard when we're finished loading it and under those conditions I think I would be required to have a Class 1 licence. Now when I go to take that test I have no vehicle - does the department provide the vehicle for me to take the test?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: How would I go about arranging for a test then?

MR. USKIW: Well, the applicant will have to arrange for a vehicle in which he is going to entertain a test of his ability.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I raise this because I think that it could cause a problem with a lot of people. I know people that would like to get, for instance, a motorcycle licence and they won't buy a motorcycle until they do get a licence. Now how are they going to get a licence, or pass a driver test in that case?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there's been no change with respect to motorcycle. That provision remains as it always was.

MR. GRAHAM: Well how does a person get a licence to drive a motorcycle?

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the member would elaborate more fully.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, if he hasn't got a motorcycle, how would he get a licence to drive one? He wants to buy one but he doesn't want to buy it until he has a licence.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, before a person can actually apply for a licence in a sense that you apply for a road test and so on, he has to have some experience in the operation of that vehicle otherwise he doesn't stand much of a chance of passing, or qualifying. So that he surely must have access, whether his own or a friend or someone's motorcycle on which he has been practicing. And that is the motorcycle that he brings in for the road test. We don't insist that the motorcycle be his own. It could be anyone else's. That, Mr. Chairman, has been the law since about 1957 as far as motorcycles are concerned.

MR. GRAHAM: Now I want to get down to the other one. On the air brake endorsement, has the department got sufficient qualified men to test people? I understand they have to take a minimum of 16 hours, is it, in the classroom?--(Interjection)--Well then I think the information bulletin that went out may have been in error in that. Can the Minister elaborate on what the qualifications are?

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, there are two parts to the examination. One is a written examination based on an air brake manual and the other part is an actual demonstration of the person's knowledge of the operation of that system. It's a practical demonstration when he's taking a test. There are incidentally courses that are being offered under the auspices of the Manitoba Trucking Association in which we participate where truck drivers are being trained and that's part of their course. But there's no requirement that the person must attend 16 hours of classroom instruction.

MR. GRAHAM: Well then, that information bulletin that came out some time ago with 16 hours classroom instruction and 8 hours practical was in error.

MR. DYGALA: That was the original thinking at that time, so it really wasn't in error, but when we examined the whole problem and the ramifications of that, it just wasn't practicable and it was not implemented.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. GRAHAM: There's another problem that has been brought to my attention in quite a few cases, Mr. Chairman. This is the operation of trucks larger than single axle by farm boys in harvest time and while they can get a driver's licence at 16, I believe they have to be 18 before they can get a driver's licence for larger trucks. Is there any consideration being given to giving exemption for farmers' sons during the harvest season to drive the larger trucks to assist in harvest?

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, in fact under the class licence the farm boy has gained an advantage over what it was before, because while a person under the old system, driver chauffeur licence system, could not obtain a chauffeur's licence until he was 18, he could obtain his driver's licence at 16. But there was a further stipulation that no person under the age 18, no matter who he was, could operate a vehicle having a gross weight in excess of 22,000 pounds. That was increased to 24,000 pounds. Now whether it stays at 24, that's another question.

MR. GRAHAM: The reason I raised it at this time, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be brought to the attention of the Legislature that there is a severe problem here, and I would hope that probably we can have some amendments to the Highway Traffic Act to clarify this problem, because there are many young fellows who may be breaking the law but they're doing it because their fathers ask them to do it because they maybe can't afford to hire a hired man or else there is none available at the time that they are required. And I think that governments should not encourage anyone to break the law. I think government should also be responsive to the needs of society if these needs are brought to their attention, and I would hope that we could probably have amendments to the Highway Traffic Act brought forward to cover this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of things regarding safety, and the one thing that I notice around the city here, and more than they do in the rural areas, these little cars go around with these great big wheels and the bumpers sticking up about three feet in the air. What regulations are in existence right today? Is this permissible? Because it sure looks like a crazy way of . . . up a car. I don't know. I don't think they should be allowed myself, but I know . . .

MR. BANMAN: Wait until you son turns 16, Earl.

MR. McKELLAR: He better not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dygala.

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, there is a section that was put in the Act three years ago, four years ago, which prohibits the raising of a suspension system. Originally it prohibited it absolutely. That is, there was to be no alterations to the suspension system from the original, as originally equipped. And there were problems with that piece of legislation because it was argued that well, if I tow a trailer, that alters the height of the suspension system, or if someone puts new shock absorbers that are different than the manufacturers' and therefore that alters the system. And an amendment was put through to cover these exceptions. As a result of that amendment, that section was weakened to the point that it is difficult to enforce. The police do try to enforce them and I think there are fewer than there were at one time, but they still exist.

MR. McKELLAR: So actually this is permissible, then, according to . . . like, I mean, there's nothing to stop these people taking their cars to the garage and put new rims on eh, and new these wide tires, eh?

MR. DYGALA: There was not actual stipulation as to the height.

MR. McKELLAR: I'll ask another question then. Doesn't that put your speedometer out by a considerable amount, and like what control have you over the vehicle? In other words, when a vehicle is manufactured, I always thought, with the exception of minor changes, you couldn't really revolutionize the car after you bought it, like . . . This is what they're doing, and I would imagine that from a safety standpoint this isn't too good. But I know that if that's the case the Act can't be enforced, well then . . . Is this permissible all across Canada, in every province of Canada?

MR. DYGALA: Well, the situation is perhaps even worse because I think we're one of very few provinces - I think there's only two others - that enacted this legislation in respect to raising our suspension systems, and they would encounter the same problems as we have. It's the problem of enforcement really at the court level.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. McKELLAR: Just a moment, I've got another couple of questions here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: This is on the speed limits, and we all know the enforcement's 55 miles an hour in the United States. To what effect does this reduce the death rate on the highways and also the accident rate? Has there been any studies made of that change in the speed limits in the United States?

MR. DYGALA: Mr. Chairman, yes, there have been some preliminary studies done and there is an argument now raging amongst a great number of people as to the extent to which the reduction of speed limit contributed to the reduction, and it was a very dramatic reduction, in traffic fatalities in the United States. There is no question but that the reduced amount of travel because of shortage of fuel was a major contributing factor. The kinds of driving patterns also change. The fact that the father would not allow the use of his car by his teenaged son or daughter also had an effect. There were a number of factors, but after you have gone through the exercise of allowing for each of them you had a residue left, and the argument is about this residue, as to whether the reduction was 8 percent or 12 percent. It's in that range. But there appears to be substantial evidence on those grounds that the 55 mile speed limit had an effect in reducing traffic fatalities in the United States, but not all authorities agree that that was indeed the case. They all concede it had effect; it's a question of how much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In this total amount of salaries, I wonder if the Minister could tell the Committee what percentage of that, or what amount of that goes to the operation of the safety clinics that go around the province and check out the different motor vehicles.

MR. USKIW: I wonder whether the member would repeat that again. Did he want a breakdown of the costs of that program?

MR. BANMAN: I would specifically like the amount that is allocated towards the safety clinics that go around the province and check out vehicles.

Maybe further to that, while we're waiting for the answer, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could inform us if the government is intending to move even heavier into the checking of motor vehicles. I notice that the Province of British Columbia has undertaken quite a tough role and it has become mandatory for every vehicle there to have a sticker on your windshield saying that you've had at least one check a year, and if that is not undertaken your licence is cancelled within 12 hours, I think, if that sticker isn't on there.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the department is adding . . . no I'm sorry. Total cost of the program, of the inspection service, is \$240,000, and we're adding two inspection units this year. It's not on a compulsory basis for all vehicles.

MR. BANMAN: That would bring it to a total of . . .

MR. USKIW: A total of four.

MR. BANMAN: Will the checks be voluntary or will there be some compulsory mailings involved?

MR. USKIW: No, there will be compulsory mailing as before.

MR. BANMAN: Would the Minister inform us as to how many compulsory checks there will be?

MR. USKIW: About 36,000.

MR. BANMAN: Would that represent then, about - what? About a little better than 10 percent of the vehicles on the roads in Manitoba?

MR. USKIW: No, it would be less than that. It would be much less than that, Mr. Chairman. About seven or eight percent. This would include vehicles of 1973 and under.

MR. BANMAN: With reference to the other question that I posed, are they studying any compulsory safety checks that would have to be taken every year as far as a certain vintage and under?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the answer I gave earlier applies. The compulsory aspect has to do with the cars that are made in 1973 or earlier.

MR. BANMAN: But you wouldn't put . . . The present program, you don't hit all of those cars.

MR. USKIW: No. No, no. It's a random sampling. The idea is that we wouldn't

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. USKIW cont'd)repeat the same ones the following year. It's a computer operation.

MR. BANMAN: So that in a matter of five years, or whatever it is, you'd hope to have hit all of them.

MR. USKIW: That's the general idea.

MR. BANMAN: And that is sort of the policy of the department?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there is just one area that I wanted to talk on, and I'm probably out of order by one section. It has to do with the special registrations or permits for vehicles, but it also includes safety and it might be acceptable in this way. And I'm referring to the problems that new technology brings with it every once in a while, in this case the hauling of the large round bales. It's presented a bit of a problem for individual ranchers and farmers that have gone into these bales. They have some difficulty in meeting the width restrictions. I understand there was some consideration given this fall to them and a cut-off date after which they were no longer permitted to haul them. I think it is particularly apropos, Mr. Chairman, that the Acting Minister of Highways, who is also the Minister of Agriculture, should be in the Chair at this particular moment. You know, these are problems that come up with changed technology, but the big bale is going to be with us. It's proven really the only economical way of hauling them is two on a truck and one up on top . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have to raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: The Member for Lakeside is way behind in the discussion. We passed that item yesterday, and I would suggest that if he wants to pursue it that that be done on the Minister's Salary, which could cover anything.

MR. ENNS: Fair game. See how easy I am, Sam?

MR. USKIW: If we don't do it that way, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be in an impossible situation.

MR. MCGREGOR: Did you talk about reducing the speed limit?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the honourable member it comes under Resolution 62(k) - Highway Traffic Inspection. Resolution 64(c)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (c)--passed. Resolution 64(d)(1)--the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes. How many members are on this Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board? And what's their names?

MR. USKIW: They are six in number, but the names are filed by Order-in-Council so they're public information.

MR. MCGREGOR: And likewise the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, how many is on that board?

MR. USKIW: Five.

MR. MCGREGOR: Taxicab Board?

MR. USKIW: Three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, couldn't they be supplied, because we haven't got time to go searching for Orders-in-Council?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point I would wonder why members would want to pursue the identity of board members. What's the relevance?

MR. MCKELLAR: Oh, we might have to appear before them some day and we want to know who they are! You never can tell. You never can tell.

MR. USKIW: Would it suffice if we gave you a list of them at any time as soon as they're available?

MR. MCKELLAR: Sure. That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64. The Honourable Minister for MPIC.

MR. URUSKI: I just want to indicate to the members that I think the Taxicab Board and the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, I believe the members interpose in the boards. But the names, I know some of them but I don't know the complete list, so I won't even venture to say who's on them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(d)(1)--passed; (2)-- The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. McKELLAR: I would like to know if there's any report, annual report, of the Motor Vehicle Branch because I can't find one in the Highways report here. Is there an annual report put out on the Motor Vehicle Branch?

MR. USKIW: No there isn't, Mr. Chairman. I'm advised that the intent is to have one out for next year.

MR. McKELLAR: There never has been, eh?

MR. USKIW: No. There's no legal requirement but years ago they did provide one.

MR. McKELLAR: Well it would be interesting, I think, if we did have that kind of information.

MR. USKIW: Well it's intended to be re-introduced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64, (d)--passed. Resolution 64. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,243,600 for Highways--passed. Resolution 65. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, my query is - it's been a problem in my part of Manitoba - access roads off P.R.'s. I know for several years at least there's been hopes. I know I spoke to the Minister's staff and the Minister, but at this hour there still isn't a program, and it's very irritating when you represent one town that accesses off a PTH, another it's off a P.R., one gets an equivalent highway, the other one does not. What does the future show? Is there indeed a hope for this type of legislation to accommodate this particular area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a gradual process that is under way. The prioritization, of course, is dependent on the total dollars provided in the budget and so on, so it is an ongoing process but it's not an aggressive one, let's say.

MR. MCGREGOR: Well, when are we going to be aggressive?

MR. USKIW: It's not aggressive. It's not a five-year program. There's no deadline set by which we intend to have that program completed with respect to every community in Manitoba, but it's an ongoing program and hopefully over a period of time it will be complete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mention was made by the Minister yesterday of the fact that there's more money than \$29 million spent on the construction of provincial roads and trunk highways in this coming year's estimates here. Now you mentioned there is some in Capital Supply, some money's going to be in Capital Supply. We had Capital Supply and I don't think there's any mention of highways in Capital Supply, with the exception of 40 million for General Purposes. Now how much money is going to be in the Capital Supply?

MR. USKIW: Well I think I mentioned yesterday that we have some authority, capital authority for highway construction, from the existing appropriations, but it is intended that we have another \$8 million when Capital Supply is put forward this year, for highway construction. It's part of the Northlands Agreement.

MR. McKELLAR: And how much money have you left in the Capital Supply from previous years? In other words, what's the total budget going to be on new construction?

MR. USKIW: Fifty-nine million dollars is the figure . . .

MR. McKELLAR: I see.

MR. USKIW: That's the figure I gave yesterday, yes.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, I realize you can't put the total amount - you finance some through current and some through Capital Supply. Now one other thing I would like to know - half your program, there's some projects in here, I know that are practically completed in the first half, some are just -- and so I suppose some haven't been started. Now does that mean that the last half will be started after the . . . Or what staging are you going to take on the program here that starts on Page 14, the second half of your highway program? Are any of those contracts advertised and let already in the second half? On Page 14 on?

MR. USKIW: Yes. The listing, as you have it, shows the remaining programs that weren't completed last year which are continuing to completion, and of course a new list of the intended new programs for this year. But obviously it's one of those situations where you quite often don't complete a given project in the year that you start the project. So there's always a carry-over into the following year. Twelve million of that, I'm advised, was pre-advertised last fall and is ready to go. It's contracted now.

MR. McKELLAR: How much are your tenders coming in above, say, a year ago? Like how much are they averaging on dirt moving?

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. USKIW: Twelve to fifteen percent would be a fair guess up from last year's contracts.

MR. McKELLAR: One road that concerns all of us - it isn't in my area, it's in the Member's for Rock Lake, and he isn't here today. Last year a start was made to No. 2 south for five miles, 5.3 miles, and that's just about completed. I was hoping that this work would be carried on because there's another 28 miles to Cartwright and this is all that would have to be left as a gravel surface, and I would hope that next year, in 1976, that maybe another ten miles completed of No. 23, and then there's still another 18 left down to No. 3 Highway, Cartwright. This is a very important road but not many people are using it because the Minister of Autopac there doesn't particularly like people to use that because the damn gravel breaks everybody's windshield and headlights, and I hope that the Department take a second look at it. I know the traffic count would be up three times as high because the American tourists like that. They can . . . into Rock Lake and Pelican Lake and all the other resorts up through Neepawa, Sprucewoods Park and so on. This is very important. I suppose that you have priorities, but I would hope that in another year further work would be done on that particular road anyway.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the member appreciates that we're not in a position to give a very definitive commitment as to what we are going to do a year from now. I can appreciate the comments he's making and . . .

MR. McKELLAR: Do it in an election year, Sam. Do it in an election year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask how many access roads a person is entitled to on a mile of - along a P. T. O. road. We have different farmers, because of the contour of the land they seem to have several approaches and then sometimes there's a whole mile and there isn't. And I have heard it said that you're entitled to one every half mile, but I just thought I'd get it officially.

MR. USKIW: The policy is to provide one to the home ground area and perhaps one to a field. There are variations, however, depending on the configuration of the area.

MR. HENDERSON: So it's not held down to any distance in particular, like if a person had a half section and it was running for a mile and he says, "I want an approach over on that side, you know." Is he entitled to one?

MR. USKIW: No. The normal process, however, would apply. If the individual wanted to submit an application, then your Highway Traffic Board - is that the board? - would take it under advisement and render a decision one way or the other.

MR. HENDERSON: If they put it in, do they supply the culvert as well as do the work?

MR. USKIW: Pardon me? I didn't get the question.--(Interjection)--No, regardless of who pays for it, it has to be approved by the Highway Traffic Board.

MR. HENDERSON: Oh yes, I realize that, but if it's approved do they supply the culvert as well as put it in for the person?

MR. USKIW: No.

MR. HENDERSON: The individual has to do both?

MR. USKIW: Yes. I'm advised that during reconstructing procedures that there are variances to that rule, but it would be where the Department feels some responsibility.

MR. HENDERSON: Well I don't know whether this is the place to bring it up or not, if we want to bring up certain provincial roads, you know, that we feel are in bad condition, but there's one piece of road I think probably that I have travelled on several times, and even though it isn't in my own constituency I figure it's got to be about the worst provincial road in the Province of Manitoba, it's 305 between No. 2 and the Assiniboine River - and that's just one terrible road. I was travelling down there the other night and I wasn't going much more than about 50 and I hit a place in there where it was so washboardy it pretty nearly turned the car sideways. I think that's really one piece of road in Manitoba that's really got to be about the worst provincial road.

I have several in my own constituency; 245 as it leads over to 244 is one that I seem to get an awful lot of complaints about, because it connects there to Stephenfield Dam from 244 and it's sandier there, and I get an awful lot of complaints from that. I do get complaints from my other ones but generally they aren't near as heavy as from those areas. And anybody that goes up to join Highway 4 up by Portage and travel 305, when they come back they're saying, "Well, why can't we get some pavement in there?" I realize you've had a problem there

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)and I appreciate it, but I think there comes a time when our civil servants have to, with government, and I'm not saying probably it isn't maybe government because of pressures that weaken more than civil servants, but I think there's times when they should go ahead and just quit listening to the people back home scrapping, because I think this is one of the reasons why we never got our highway through La Riviere from 1965 to 1975 and now they've decided just to keep quiet and they're just waiting for the government. I think maybe that might be a sensible approach for people to take and listen to their engineers and the survey men who have done a good job and let them go ahead with it a lot of times, because when you get a lot of local groups and pressure groups and political groups' influence, I think we sometimes come up with the wrong decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. The first question I'd like to ask is, what is the cost-sharing deal between the Feds and the Province on the construction of No. 1? Is it by a mile or how is it done?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: I'm advised that Trans-Canada does not imply that there is federal money other than in the new agreement for upgrading, but the tradition has been that they put no money in, not even for maintenance. It's called Trans-Canada but it's really a provincial cost. The history of it is that the two lanes from Ontario through to Saskatchewan was a 50-50.

MR. FERGUSON: All right. This is considered upgrading now when it goes to four-lane?

MR. USKIW: No. No, that is not correct. The upgrading has to do with road strengthening to allow for higher vehicle weights up to 110,000 pounds.

MR. FERGUSON: Then there is no assistance on the construction of No. 1 that is taking place now.

The next question would be to deal with 353 into Brookdale. Work was started on it; it wasn't completed. Was this because it froze up early, or what was the reason for this?

MR. USKIW: That is what is assumed although I'm not in a position to give you a definitive answer on that.

MR. FERGUSON: This has been contracted for and it will be completed as soon as the weather is . . . ?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay. And the next would be to do with Highway 260 - this is the place that we're all supposed to air our beefs. This is the one that I get the biggest one over, and this is north of - in the Plumas-Tenby area. I think the Deputy will be quite familiar with it. But this is piece of road that I certainly would like to see upgraded and possibly black-topped because it does serve quite a large area and it has been, I think it's about three or four miles north of Plumas it has been blacktopped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The question that I want to ask deals with something of a general nature with respect to arteries of traffic leading into the province, and I am particularly interested in Highway 75. I know that there will be a continuation of the bituminous paving of Highway 75 from Morris south to the Junction of Highway 14, which will complete that highway as a resurfacing job, but I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there are any plans for making that highway four-lane, and I'm sure that anyone that's travelled that can recognize the stark difference in the quality of highways the minute you get across the border where you immediately get into a four-lane highway and then that same traffic that has been accommodated in the four-lane highway coming north of the border suddenly has to converge into a two-lane highway and not a very good one at that. I recognize the difficulties and I recognize the costs, but sooner or later the government's going to have to make a decision as to whether or not they're going to provide for better roads coming into this province from the United States, as they are doing on an east-west basis, and I wonder if the department could give us some idea of when the people along that route can expect, and the people who use it - and it's being used with greater frequency and greater weights every year - when they can expect that there will be a decision made as to the improvement of that road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well I think the only thing we can indicate is some intent direction here. I'm sure the member looked at Page 18 wherein we show some 4.6 miles of four lane at the

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. USKIW cont'd)south limit of Winnipeg to P.R. 429, so that is really the direction that it's going, but it's a matter of time. And, of course, acquisition of right-of-way is the undertaking . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes. Is that the beginning of a continuation of four-laning that highway all the way to the border?

MR. USKIW: Well, that is what is hoped, but it's a matter of time as to when . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, I recognize that, you know, there isn't a possibility you're going to do it all in one year, but if we can be given some hope that that's the beginning of a process to four-lane that highway completely, that's fine. But I was wondering, in that connection, if it is the intention to eventually four-lane the entire route, what happens at Morris? If you go east you're going to run into the river, if you go west you're going to have to cross four railroad tracks. You seem destined to route that highway through the Town of Morris. What are you going to do? Build overpasses so people can cross the street? There's going to be a tremendous volume of traffic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, the department advises that it's certainly not that far advanced in their analysis and studies that have been undertaken. They recognize that eventually they want to see a four-lane highway all the way through to the U.S. border, but, you know, that certainly is not going to happen in the next year or two.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, but I wonder in that connection, it may be several years before that's done, but already you have an existing road that could perhaps serve as a pressure outlet for traffic on Highway 75, and that's Highway 330 which is already paved as far as La Salle, and we were under the impression that there was an intention to continue the surfacing of that road straight through to Morris. Now the entire road has been re-graded; it's capable of being surfaced - I think that the specifications on that highway are such that all it requires now is the surfacing itself. There is no more grading and no more land acquisition to take place. And I wonder if, in the meantime, that road cannot be surfaced and then be used as a relief outlet for Highway 75.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, the department has no particular position on that particular road at the moment, although the observation is a good one. But there's no current plans in that connection.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I'll leave it with the department, then, to give it very serious consideration, and even if they do that I figure that will be progress. I'm also concerned about Highway 240. This is one that has been a long-standing gripe with the people of the St. Claude area. There is a tremendous volume of communication between Portage la Prairie and St. Claude, and the condition of that road at the present time is such that it's something better than good communications and I see nothing in the plans for this year that there's going to be any acquisition of right of way or any indication that there's going to be an improvement of that grade, which has something like nine right-angle turns in the short distance from Portage to St. Claude. It seems to me that the people of that area are entitled to something a little bit better in the way of communication than what they have at the present time. What are the plans there?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would be entertained by perhaps some views of some other MLA's representing the Conservative party on that one.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, I know the conflict that exists, but you will note, Mr. Chairman, that I'm aware of what's now existing in the plans, and that's the surfacing of Highway 305 from the Junction of Highway No. 1 to Assiniboine River, and I can only conclude from that that it is the intention of the department to complete the surfacing of that road down to at least Highway No. 2, and, you know, it will be, in my view, a somewhat useless piece of road because there's a great deal more traffic over 240 than there is on 305. But be that as it may, I did not request that the highway be paved. What I did request was that Highway 240 be upgraded and made into a serviceable road, one that does not contain nine bloody right-hand turns and very dangerous driving conditions, to a highway that at least is brought up to some kind of a standard. It is a provincial road and let's make it look like a provincial road, because as it is at the present time it's a disgrace, like a good many of the other roads, provincial roads, that we have in this province.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

Well, if there's going to be no comment on it, I assume that my remarks have been noted and will be considered.

MR. USKIW: They have been weighted accordingly, sir.

MR. JORGENSEN: One other comment, and that's in connection with Highway 424 as an access road from Highway No. 2 to Springstein - another contentious point. It's a short stretch of road and Springstein is becoming a fairly substantial commuting centre right now. And several years ago I brought to the attention of the department the fact that that community certainly is entitled to an access road that is far better than the one they have at the present time, and I notice there is nothing on the plans here but I wonder if there is going to be some indication that the people of Springstein can have, that they may even come into the twentieth century themselves and get an access road so that they can move in and out without jarring the daylight out of their cars and the suffering from the slings and arrows of flying stones.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that one I'm advised the department may be a little more enthusiastic than some of the other proposals that the Member for Morris has put forward so far.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, on that very happy note, Mr. Chairman, I will desist from further questioning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me say I'm glad to see that the department is going to go ahead and acquire land with regard to the expressway between Steinbach and the No. 1 highway. I think the residents of that area will be very happy to hear that news. It's a very well-travelled road and has caused a fair amount of problems to people travelling on it, and, of course, it's very important to Steinbach because we haven't got a railway.

Secondly, I'd also like to say that I see that the Trans-Canada Highway is being completed all the way to Falcon Lake, which I think is a very good step forward too. We've seen some bad accidents there the last couple of summers, especially on that stretch around the East Braintree area, and I'm again glad to see that going in.

When it comes to highways I realize that even the members on the Opposition sometimes have conflicts with their own caucus because everybody is trying to get something for his constituency and what he thinks would be used to best benefit to his constituency. But I would like to ask (1) The 52 highway, PTH 52 from Steinbach to La Broquerie, it's in real bad repair and I noticed last year the land acquisition was undertaken, and I understand that's been completed but for some reason it's been dropped off the . . . or hasn't been put onto this year's program, and with the repair of that road right now, I find that very difficult to understand, and I wonder if the Minister could tell me why it was dropped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, I gather there is some difference of opinion as to alternate possibilities there. I believe there are two routes that are under review with respect to upgrading and I'm not just sure that I can be more definitive than that other than the department is looking at it.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if I could ask the Minister, then, has the department had representation with regards to the upgrading and paving of the 210?

MR. USKIW: Yes, I'm advised we have.

MR. BANMAN: So that would be the conflict that's involved right now.

MR. USKIW: That's part of the consideration.

MR. BANMAN: Further to that, I wonder if I could have some idea as to if the department intends to do anything with the 311, the 311 running from the No. 12 highway to the 210. I notice on this year's projects we have some paving on 311 from the 12 to the 206, and then there's also land acquisition from the 206 to the 59 on 311. But there's a short stretch of road, about five miles, that runs from the little hamlet of Drew to the No. 12 highway. It's a very well travelled road and it's in real rough repair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. USKIW: Were you finished?

MR. BANMAN: I'm waiting for a reply.

MR. USKIW: Oh I see. I thought you were making an observation.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. BANMAN: I'm sorry. I'm just wondering if there's anything in the works with regards to this 311, the stretch - it's about a 5.5 mile stretch and I understand that the R. M. of Hanover and several other councils have presented resolutions with regards to that stretch of the road. It's a real bad one and I think the traffic count is fairly good on it; it runs from the No. 12 to the 210.

MR. USKIW: There's no immediate consideration there. It's under review, but the department advises that they are looking at that as an eventual access after the . . . to Drew that is, from 12, is it? Yes, from Highway 12 once 12 is upgraded.

MR. BANMAN: Another question with regard to the 303. Is there anything being contemplated for the 303 running from the 12 towards Kleefeld?

MR. USKIW: There's nothing at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BANMAN: Well, with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would have liked to see a lot more but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: I see on Page 20 that there is 6.2 for acquisition of right of way on No. 258. Would the Minister just explain what's going on there, please?

MR. USKIW: The acquisition of right of way is part of the ongoing process where we are endeavouring to pre-plan somewhat ahead of construction schedules and so on, so that we don't have the bottlenecks of surveys and so on, so that it's anticipated that in due course there will be upgrading of some sort taking place there.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we dealt with highways estimates in the past I think I've always tried to deal more with the total picture for the Province of Manitoba, but I would like to at this time digress a little, if I may, and talk about some of the things in Birtle-Russell. First of all, I'd like to ask the Minister a question. We really have two sets of projects tabled here before us and I was wondering if we could get an explanation of what difference there is between the two sets of projects, or if there is a duplication in these.

MR. USKIW: Oh, I think what you're talking about, sir, is the unfinished works of last year and the new projects for this year.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, if that's the explanation, then I would like to ask the Minister about Highways 41 and 42. I see we have the unfinished work from last year on 41 and 42, a total of 5.7 miles, from east of the Assiniboine River to the South Junction of 568, and then we also have another project 41 and 42 from King Street in St. Lazare, 4.7 miles, to 568. And I was wondering if it's the intention, if these are two separate projects, if in fact the department was going to be generous and upgrade the existing road before they turned it over to the municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GRAHAM: One is 5.7 miles and the other is 4.7 . . .

MR. USKIW: No, but I gather, Mr. Chairman, that the member is alleging that one of these, a portion is going to be turned over to the municipality.

MR. GRAHAM: No. I was just asking if this is what . . . if they were going to rebuild the old one too and maybe that's why there's two projects.

MR. USKIW: It's not two projects, I'm advised; it's the same project. Part of it was done last year.

MR. GRAHAM: Then can I ask the Minister if the site location has been finalized on the entire section of that road?

MR. USKIW: Yes, I'm advised that it has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. GRAHAM: No, I'm not finished yet.

MR. USKIW: The department advises they've decided but, you know, there's always the possibility of a variation, but they have made a decision.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister then tell me what site they have chosen for the hill at St. Lazare? Is it the existing location?

MR. USKIW: Is it east of St. Lazare?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. USKIW: The original location, yes.

MR. GRAHAM: What precautions are being taken at the King Street to ensure adequate safety with heavy trucks coming down that hill?

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. USKIW: I would presume that the member is inquiring as to construction design, is that it?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. USKIW: The department is advising that they are taking all the precautions that are feasible to alleviate the problems in the slip sections.

MR. GRAHAM: Well I'm sure the department is fully aware of the problems that exist there and I would ask now - you are now satisfied that the maximum safety precautions can be achieved with this present site location?

MR. USKIW: The department feels that they are generally satisfied with the present arrangement.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What has been contemplated for target date for completing the four lane to Brandon, say have you an objective date in the head?

MR. USKIW: The projection is that if we maintain some pace, that 1978 would appear to be the date that we arrive but you know that has to be subject to considerations here again on a number of occasions.

MR. MCGREGOR: And then a further question is the follow-up. What would be the future date, say, to the Saskatchewan border, say the surveys, etc.?

MR. USKIW: I think the Honourable Member for Virden wishes me to advise him on my findings of the crystal ball.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, I wouldn't mind and then I can see how wrong you can be. Mr. Chairman, then if . . .

MR. USKIW: There's no projection that far, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCGREGOR: There's one area here, right in the centre of my constituency, that if you look on the map, it's 259 from what is known as the Oo-za-we-kwun Airport west to 21, you get a westward traffic hardtop except that bottleneck. It does seem as though it would be reasonable to expect that some time, and whilst I have come up pretty dry as I often do on what the projections are on our green sheets, but that one is one that is certainly in need with the programs at Rivers Airport. It would be hoped that it would be looked on with favour in this coming year at least for the next year's estimates. No promises eh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very grateful for the work done in my area which comes as a surprise to the Department of Transport. There's been a lot of work done on 391, 392 to outlying settlements. It's a big job you're doing and I'm very appreciative. There's a road from Flin Flon to Big Island Lake - that's a distance of 4.1 miles, that you cut off 10 miles. My honourable friend from Morris speaks of nine right angle turns - I was going to say we had nine left angle turns but that would put us around in two complete circles and actually it wasn't that bad. But however it doesn't matter what you do there's someone doesn't like something about it.

I have got a complaint from one of my constituents that the crew that is building this road are using an enormous amount of dynamite and they're not storing it safely in his opinion. Also, one complaint that they are using their trailers in the provincial park. I wonder if you'd just look into that for me and let me know the score. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: . . . a couple of questions. I just wondered, how much is left of the Perimeter Highway to complete on the eastern 101 I guess it is, Highway 101? How many miles are left to complete?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: I'm sorry, I . . .

MR. MCKELLAR: Well I just wondered how many miles left of the Perimeter Highway to complete before it is complete?

MR. USKIW: About 10 miles from 59 to 15 is the area left unfinished.

MR. MCKELLAR: Approximately 10 miles. Well I just have one other thing, and it applies to 334. On last year's road program there was a survey to be taken from Shilo south to the Assiniboine River, and I guess it would be to the location of a bridge on the Assiniboine. Mention was made by one of my colleagues yesterday that a ferry was better than a bridge.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) Well, I'll take the bridge any day. I mean if he doesn't want a bridge . . . I think we got them one of . . . there's two ferries left, Stockton and Treesbank. Stockton, it's maintained and operated by the Municipality of South Cypress, and the one at Treesbank is operated by the Municipality of South Cypress but it's paid for by the Department of Highways. But in 1969 this bridge was in the estimates and to be built just on the line between South Cypress and Ochre municipalities on the Assiniboine. It just so happened that the Minister of Highways who was appointed at that time had worked for the Criddle's at Treesbank and he said there wasn't enough traffic to even warrant a ferry, hardly a bridge - Mr. Borowski. So that killed our bridge, and there's a lot of interest in the construction of this bridge and I see it isn't in this year. But I hope maybe that's on for election year too, that bridge will be located on that --(Interjection)-- Yes, 1977, Steve says. Maybe that bridge will . . . it could accommodate a large volume of traffic because there's no bridges between Brandon and Glenboro on the Assiniboine - 50 miles. And it's a large area without - and two ferries in the . . . So I just wanted to bring this to the attention of the Department of Highways. I realize that bridges cost money and they have to have priorities too. The people out there would appreciate something, if some planning was done. It won't have to be done next year but it's something that they would appreciate anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: With respect to the bridge which apparently was shelved in 1969 by some people who thought at that time that they had greater wisdom, I'm advised that the design work is done and I believe site and surveys and that there is some disagreement within the community as to actual location, and that has yet to be resolved. But the intent seems to be to proceed with the building of a bridge.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, yes I realize that, but I think the municipalities of both Ochre and South Cypress and the Village of Wawanesa, who are partly involved there, are all convinced it should be built on the town line or as close to the town line as possible, and this is where the surveys have been taken I understand. I think that problem, I think I wouldn't worry too much about that one. I realize that you can't satisfy everybody anyway. But it's a direct line between Shilo and connecting up Wawanesa with 18 Highway 2 going to Killarney.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe there's some upgrading on 276 scheduled for this year, and also 364, three and a half miles, upgrading from 276 to the Town of Rorketon. I'm just wondering whether we're going to put a seal coat on that after we've updated it, because we have done about 24 miles from Ste. Rose and we have been putting in about 10 miles of seal coat up-grading.

MR. USKIW: It's not in this year's program, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: The upgrading is there though, eh?

MR. USKIW: There's acquisition of right of way. That is all that is listed in this year's program for 276.

MR. ADAM: Have you made a decision on by-passing Manipogo? We've had some problems there. Has that been settled?

MR. USKIW: Yes, it's going west.

MR. ADAM: You're going to move that over west from . . .

MR. USKIW: That's right.

MR. ADAM: And have you had a request from the Municipality of Oak River in regard to a municipal road off 480 to No. 20? There's a lot of traffic on 480 and when they get to about three miles north of No. 5 they cut across at the end of the lake there and as a result of this the Oak River is facing a lot of extra traffic and maintenance on that road.

MR. USKIW: Well, that is being reviewed. That proposal is being reviewed but there is no commitment whatever at the present time.

MR. ADAM: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 65. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Just a final question before we get off this particular item. I note with a great deal of satisfaction that there is a plan to do some work right in the Town of Morris itself in 1975. But I was wondering when the start-up date for that particular piece of construction is going to take place. Is it going to be before or after the third week in July?

MR. USKIW: The answer is hopefully before.

SUPPLY- HIGHWAYS

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, will it hopefully be . . .

MR. USKIW: I'm advised very shortly.

MR. JORGENSEN: Will it hopefully be finished before the third week in July?

MR. USKIW: The information I have is that if it is anticipated that it can't be completed before then that they would prefer not to start it till after.

MR. JORGENSEN: That would be my preference too.

MR. USKIW: All right. Contractor willing - this is the other problem.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, do not stop if you've got a contract.

MR. USKIW: Okay.

MR. JORGENSEN: We'll have to live with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 65, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$29, 737, 700 for Highways--Passed.

That leaves us with Resolution 61(a) Minister's Compensation. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I think this has been . . . I'd like to say this, I think that with the help of the staff and their being able to speak on the behalf of the Minister on many questions - I think this has been a very good exercise. I appreciate, you know, the informal way that it's been handled too, and I think this . . . Whether all the other members think the same as I do, but I think this has been very good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hate to allow the Minister's Salary to go by without at least one word of criticism. I would hope that when members are addressing correspondence to the department that it does not have to take two or three months before a reply is received. It seems to me that there can be an expediting of replies to correspondence that are directed to the Minister's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass this final item, I'd just like to make the observation that I don't know what newspapers the Minister reads, but I would hope that . . .

MR. USKIW: Sometimes none.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . I would hope that if he happens to be reading this evening's newspapers with respect to proceedings of this committee yesterday, I would hope that he puts more stock in the Free Press story than in the Tribune story, because the Free Press reported accurately my concerns about the bridge at St. Adolphe and the Tribune apparently was confused, or I perhaps confused them as to the point I was trying to make. The head on the Tribune story says "Bridge to link suburbs termed political decision." Well, that's the complete opposite of what I was trying to say. The bridge to link the suburbs, i.e. Fort Garry and St. Vital, I think is very necessary, and would in no way be a political decision. The bridge at St. Adolphe seemed to me to be unjustifiable on any but political grounds. I just want to make that observation in case the Minister is confused by his evening newspapers.

MR. USKIW: Well, I think I understood the debate fully yesterday, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 61(a)--passed. Resolution 61 Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$600, 700 for highways--Passed.

That completes the Department of Highways. It's time for us to join our colleagues in the House.

* * * * *

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

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 9

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. The first item is Resolution 9. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has 15 minutes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I had pretty well said what I intended to say on this resolution during my brief remarks the last time this resolution was before us. I suggest to the House, Mr. Speaker, that we do acknowledge the problems raised by the Honourable Member from Gladstone in this resolution, that we seek some, or we at least indicate our willingness to address ourselves to the problem by accepting this resolution.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we, in speaking to this resolution on this side of the House, have indicated that it was a problem that could easily be solved. We recognize the jurisdictional problems; we recognize that the Federal Government has a major part to play in resolving this matter; we recognize the rights of the people directly involved in this resolution, namely the members of the Indian community. But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, it's our very firm belief that if we are to help create an aura or a climate of better understanding in this contentious area, then we should at least be addressing ourselves to it. We can't, on the one hand, press forward and press our Minister of Mines, Resources or Environmental people, authorities, to exert good and proper measure of conservation with respect to our wildlife on a certain segment of our society and our public, and then not do the same, or not attempt, at least, to make those standards universally acceptable, acknowledging the history, acknowledging the tradition that lies beneath the problem.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I ask the House to consider the advisability of adopting this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'd support this resolution. It has a lot of good points brought up by the Member for Gladstone, of course who, like myself, he doesn't get up and make long speeches. He gets up; he says in a very short time what he wants to say. I'd like to say just a few words about abusing our game laws, and they are abused by everyone.

I don't think we should make a point of just blaming one segment or one part of our society. Miners always abused game laws. During long strikes, it was fair ball to go out and get meat if you were hungry. There was nothing wrong with that. Most fishermen abuse game laws terribly. We have an eight-fish limit or sixteen fillet, whatever, and I'll tell you, the Snow Lake on the first move over, we moved over there with nothing, and you had to buy a house, you had to borrow a down payment and make high payments, the pickerel were running and you filled your freezer. I, among many others, broke the game laws.

The American tourists, I think, are possibly one of our worst offenders, Mr. Speaker. It's nothing for an American tourist to shoot cow moose in trophy season. It's done quite commonly. It's nothing to find a bull moose just with the horns or head removed - the worst kind of game abuse. I can see a lot of leeway in people who need meat if the meat is used, but most of all, Mr. Speaker, I think we should get a picture from our friends, the Native people, and they did make a press release on March 27th and here's what they're saying. "The Indian people are angry and confused at the allegations being made by wildlife people and Manitoba MLAs" - and I see they put all MLAs in the same category - "blaming Indians as the culprits and sole cause of our depleting deer populations. The Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, after some discussion and investigation done by our people, have come up with a list of causes that are also helping to cause this problem, namely: depletion of deer habitat caused by (a) over-grazing by cattle due to lateness of winter these last two years." And that's reasonable, Mr. Speaker, but natural too. "(b) Opening up of new areas for agricultural purposes such as grazing and grain crops." That also makes sense to me. "(c) Development of tourist areas." Another natural thing. The more you develop, the further the game goes back in the bush. "Development of recreation areas for snowmobile users." There's a good one, Mr. Speaker. The snowmobiles are abused.

"2. Increased population of natural enemies such as wolves and coyotes verified by northern trappers. Night hunting by people other than Indian people." I think this is the part that possibly would cause the most conflict. I don't think night hunting is by Indians alone. I think many white people hunt with lights, one way or another.

"Farmers hunting out of season." Now, Mr. Speaker, do you think there's a farmer in this House that hasn't shot a deer out of season? Do you think the deer on farmers' property

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. BARROW cont'd) don't in time become the property of that farmer for the natural feeling for them? Do you know that in the Riding Mountain that the farmers feed the elks in times of deep snow and hardship and those elk are possibly looked upon as theirs? Do you think a farmer would hesitate to shoot a wild animal?

"The other statements about Indians killing off deer are completely erroneous because, first, about 50 percent of the Indian reserves have no deer on the reserves or in their normal hunting areas. These are areas north of the 53rd parallel. The native population of Winnipeg is approximately 10,000. Most of these people have never used wild game since moving into the city. The higher cost of transportation, ammunition, firearms, eliminate a large number of our people, Indian people, from pursuing these avocations.

"The accusations placed upon us Indian people by MLAs and civil servants, to entice racism upon a minority group to cover for themselves because they don't know what has really caused the depletion of deer simply because they haven't had the foresight or willingness to address themselves to the situation adequately, should be totally unacceptable to all Manitobans."

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution, but I would say that all the rules, all the regulations, apply to everyone. Thank you very much.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 22. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: I gather there is a feeling that the House might now adjourn and, if I am correct in that, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.