

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, May 24, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 51 students of Grade 6 standing of the Gilbert Plains Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Dodds, Mr. Friesen and Mrs. Tuzyk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways. And also as our guests we have 30 students of Grade 6 standing of the James Madison School of Fargo, N.D. These students are under the direction of Mr. Melarvie.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Gimli.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Thursday, May 23, 1974, and heard representation with respect to the various Bills referred to it as follows:

Bill No. 38: Charles Chappell - on behalf of The Rural Municipality of Springfield.

Bill No. 46: R. A. Wankling, Deputy Mayor, City of Winnipeg. S. Juba, Mayor, City of Winnipeg. D. C. Lennox, Q.C., Solicitor, City of Winnipeg.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 4 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act,

No. 25 - An Act to Validate an Agreement made between The Provincial Exhibition of Manitoba, The City of Brandon, and the Government of Manitoba.

No. 30 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. GOTTFRIED: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): On behalf of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs introduced (by leave) Bill No. 76 an Act to validate Certain By-laws of Certain Municipalities.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to the Prime Minister's announcement in connection with the overhaul base in Winnipeg. I wonder if the government's in a position to indicate the staging out of Winnipeg by CAE and to indicate to the House at what point CAE will not be operating in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the exact time scheduling of that is subject to further information yet to be obtained. All we have confirmation of at the moment is the following two major points: that Air Canada will move immediately to acquire the CAE facility, lease it back to them for an interim period, and concurrent with that Air Canada will proceed with the necessary preliminary stages of preparation for the construction of an additional hangar facility that presumably is to be somewhere in the order of \$12 to \$14 million, which combined facilities thereafter will provide an overhaul capacity for Boeing aircraft and other types of aircraft on a line maintenance basis, it is my understanding, and Boeing aircraft on a major basis.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce then. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister will confirm the fact that as of 1970-71 CAE employed 1,000 people in Manitoba and that with the proposals of the new overhaul base 800 people will be employed, with the result that there will be a net loss to Manitoba of 200.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): I believe at one point the employment level of CAE did achieve that target level of 1,000 but there were variations. At that point I believe they were engaged in a large American military contract which created quite a number of jobs.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Industry can confirm the fact that he made representation on behalf of Manitoba indicating to the Federal Government that the high employment in 1970-71 was at 1,000 and that there had been a decrease to approximately 300, and asking the Federal Government to live up to its commitments at that time given to CAE, to bring its employment factor into the neighbourhood of 800?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we made our best efforts to create jobs for the people of Winnipeg, for the people of Manitoba, and there are many ways of doing this and many combinations, and I think our essential purpose in this government and in this House should be to create employment for our people, the best way possible.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate that insofar as his government is concerned, that the announcements made by the Prime Minister with reference to the takeover by Air Canada of CAE and the building of one hangar, in any way satisfies, insofar as his government is concerned, the actual removal of the Air Canada overhaul base, commitments that were given to CAE with respect to the air industry in Manitoba and with respect to what could have been and should have been the development in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that depends to what base or expectation one is wanting to relate the announcement to. I will say very bluntly, Mr. Speaker, that there is need to ascertain more specifically and definitively, more precisely, just what the level of activity of employment in overhaul activity at the re-established Air Canada Winnipeg base will be, before I would presume to make any kind of value judgment as to whether or not commitments are being lived up to. All I can say for the moment is, that until very recently there was scant reason to believe that Winnipeg would regain the ground that was lost in the decade of the 1960s with respect to Air Canada overhaul work; and that, Sir, is an episode that goes over a period of 15 years and there are more than one party implicated in it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable First Minister. The Minister announced yesterday that people in Winnipeg and outside of Winnipeg would receive assistance for cleaning up basements in flooded areas. I wonder would he consider extending the program to include cleaning up debris on farm properties that have been flooded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, what I indicated yesterday was that with respect to those households in which the resident was either aged or infirm that we were through the student employment office, through student manpower, allocating student manpower, student man-days, for clean-up. This applies to those aged and infirm living within the City of Winnipeg that had basement premise damage and it also applies to other households in the flooded areas of the province inhabited by persons who are aged and infirm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce with reference to the announcement by the Federal Government of a new regional air service to connect Winnipeg-Brandon-Dauphin-Yorkton and Saskatoon. I wonder if the Minister can indicate the target date for the commencement of that service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter we've been in discussions about for the past several months with the Federal Minister of Transportation, and frankly in my opinion the announcement was a bit premature because all the details have not been worked out. I was

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. EVANS cont'd) pleased to hear the announcement regarding this matter; we knew it was rather positive that it was coming but I would hope that such service would be implemented as soon as feasible.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then could the Minister confirm that when the service is initiated that the operator will be either an existing carrier or operated directly by Air Canada as the Prime Minister seemed to indicate in his publicity release?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there has been no final agreement on this. In some ways ideally I believe Air Canada, a subsidiary of Air Canada, would be the best vehicle giving us access to their capacity, their management expertise and their technical expertise and so on, that would be the ideal vehicle; but again I think this is subject to further discussions and negotiations between ourselves and the Federal Government. There are other alternatives but as I said these still have to be explored.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In respect to the kind of aircraft that will be used it was indicated that it would be a Saunders aircraft. Can the Minister then indicate whether it will be the current model ST-27 or the prototype which is now under development, the SC-27B with its somewhat longer range under IFR conditions?

MR. EVANS: Well I really can't confirm that. Frankly, the new model as the honourable member knows is identical in capability and performance and so on with the existing model. The only difference is the new model is built as I say from scratch but it's an identical aircraft.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYDAXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister of Labour that in respect to the potential for several hundred new jobs now coming to Winnipeg as a result of the air base maintenance proposal, can the Minister describe what plans this government is making to initiate training programs in the field of air mechanic and overhaul to provide for those new jobs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that the announcement of the Prime Minister did catch me a little unaware of what was forthcoming and I appreciated the fact that we were going to have to provide for considerable number of extra hundreds of jobs in the air industry and that it would require an endeavour on the part of the apprentice training division to try and increase the output of qualified mechanics in order that we would be able to, on an even flow basis, supply the aero industry with competent help. That matter is under consideration as of now.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell us whether any direction or planning has been given to the community colleges in the Winnipeg area, particularly Red River Community College, to set up special divisions or sections for the training of aircraft mechanics and maintenance?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable friend will realize that having heard the complete announcement this morning for the first time I haven't had an opportunity of having discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Education and Community Colleges. There are some courses at the college at the present time - air frame mechanics and the likes of that. I doubt whether or not the input at the present time could adequately supply the industry. I will be discussing this matter with the sub-committee on employment and immigration.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister, considering the fact that the Provincial Government has been in the process of making representations to the Federal Government over the past six or eight months concerning the development of new facilities, could the Minister explain why there hasn't been some prior planning undertaken to provide for these new jobs . . . ?

MR. PAULLEY: The only answer I can give to my nonhonourable friend in that regard, we have been propositioning Ottawa for a considerable number of years to return to Manitoba the air facilities. I accompanied the Honourable the present Leader of the Opposition down there on one or two occasions and went down on three additional occasions to do what has apparently been achieved by the announcement of yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) of Labour. Just this morning it was indicated - the Leader of the Official Opposition indicated twice that he would use . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Would he indicate what is his policy in regards to settlement of strikes? Are they like the Leader of the Official Opposition who indicated that we use force to prevent strikes?

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and ask him now whether his portfolio will be extended to include in addition to Commissar for Railways will be extended to include airlines as well now?

But while I'm on my feet, Sir, I would like to by leave of the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable gentleman is indulging in games then I am not interested in having him on his feet. The honourable member have a point of order?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Yes I have. I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is not a point of order.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I have a question. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Labour indicate what is his policy in regard to settlement of strikes. Are they like the policies of the Leader of the Official . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I wonder if I can have the co-operation of all the honourable members that when I ask for order they will honour as gentlemen the rules of this House and acquiesce. And let me also indicate that the rules in respect to questions apply to all sides and if they are impertinent or out of order it will so be stated. One cannot express an opinion in asking their question. That is out of order. Consequently the Honourable Member for Radisson has disqualified himself from that particular question.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make some changes on committees. I wonder if I, by leave of the House ask that the name of Mr. Craik be substituted for that of Mr. Bilton; Mr. McGill be substituted for that of Mr. Brown; Mr. Henderson be substituted for that of Mr. McKellar on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister in charge of Environmental Management. Can he advise whether in the control of cankerworms by spraying that it is in order for people on private lands to do aerial spraying?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, I make the same response to this as I made with regard to mosquitoes. There are certain chemicals that have been approved for use by whatever insecticide inspection there is at the Ottawa level and the Clean Environment Commission unless they were asked to receive the complaint has not involved itself in private spraying; they have involved itself where the city has applied to them to engage in a major program. I presume that the honourable member's question, and I appreciate that there is no logical distinction, that it could apply to a person using a fly spray in his house, so it doesn't apply to activities of a private nature - has not been although technically the Act, I repeat, could apply to somebody smoking his pipe. That is not the practical application of the Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the mounting concern of cankerworms, can the Minister indicate whether--Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask will be of benefit to the Member for Radisson as well. Can the Minister indicate whether an appeal at this point is possible to the Clean Environment Commission to reconsider whether or not aerial spraying will be allowed on public properties.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the city wished to appeal, I'm not sure that the time has expired but my understanding was that the City was going to proceed in accordance with the order of the Clean Environment Commission. I've not received any appeal from the City.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party asked a question which I took as notice, relative to the disposition of Manitoba

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Hydro campsite bunkhouses and facilities surplus to immediate needs, and the information is as follows: That at the Gillam townsite there was a total of 114 mobile homes, of which 39 have been transferred or are soon to be transferred to other sites for family accommodation; four have been converted to field offices; 71 have been retained at Gillam for family accommodation. That in addition to that there were some 24 bunkhouses of about 100-man capacity at the Kettle site of which 24 one complete unit, one complete bunkhouse unit was destroyed by fire and has now been replaced by two 56-man units. I mention that because in the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party's question, there was a suggestion that there had been disposal of some units by fire. Well that is strictly speaking correct, Mr. Speaker, except the fire was accidental.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It's with reference to the third level carrier in the service mentioned by the Prime Minister with reference, particularly to Brandon and the other areas. I wonder if he could indicate whether in the discussions with the Federal Government, it has been suggested or proposed that--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, I believe you still are the Speaker of the House. I wonder if he can indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether in the discussions with the Federal Government the province has proposed or has considered the possibility of forming a Crown corporation with the Province of Saskatchewan to operate this air service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered a similar question, it was posed by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. There were various alternatives explored, and we have come to no final agreements, and I have not yet had the opportunity to see the full text of the Prime Minister's statement, but I believe he did make some reference to an Air Canada subsidiary. But there are many options, many alternatives, and there's been no final decision on our part at least.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce can indicate whether discussions have been held with the Province of Saskatchewan with respect to this alternative.

MR. EVANS: We have had discussions with the Province of Saskatchewan with respect to providing air service to the various communities mentioned, namely Saskatoon, Yorkton, Dauphin, Winnipeg and Brandon. And again many avenues are being considered.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has been given information by the Federal Government as to the air carrier that will be allowed, the new service to be undertaken from Winnipeg into the United States, when the bilateral agreements staging starts to take place. Will it be a Manitoba-based airline or will it be Air Canada?

MR. EVANS: Well the honourable member referred to bilaterals. The national airline, yes, Air Canada received the service between--the rights between Winnipeg and New York direct, and there is one other carrier, Frontier Airlines, as you know, between Winnipeg south. I'm not sure which airline the honourable gentleman was referring to, but those are the two new services that we expect to see based on the Federal Government's bilateral negotiations and agreement with the United States.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether as a result of the bilateral agreements, there is not to be a new air service from Winnipeg to Chicago.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was provision in the agreements for an American carrier to set up a service between Chicago and Winnipeg but there are also provisions in that agreement regarding timing. As I understand the agreement, the carrier need not necessarily begin the service immediately. We suspect the carrier involved may be Northwest Airlines and I do intend, we have already been in touch with that airline; I do hope to meet with the President very soon to see just what that airline plans. But my understanding is that the negotiations resulted in agreement which was rather vague in its wording and did provide the airline, the American airline, with some leeway time.

MR. SPIVAK: Again, I'd like the Minister to indicate it because this is the first knowledge that I have that it's an American airline. It is an American airline, it will not be a Canadian airline that will be providing that service?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. EVANS: Yes, in the initial instance it will be an American airline. In a matter of, I don't know, three and a half years or thereabouts, three to four years, a Canadian airline will be permitted to go into operation. But, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is very concerned about this matter we can endeavour to get him a copy of the agreement and he can study it, as can other members for themselves, because it is subject to some interpretation and perhaps some misinterpretation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. In reference to the statements made on the summer temporary employment program, will the Minister undertake to supply to members of this House a list of the STEP projects that have been established in their respective areas and the services they provide to those citizens, so that the inquiries we're now receiving can be properly handled and the information passed on to members of our constituencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can attempt to do that but then again there is need to make a distinction between those students temporary employment projects that are of a kind quite unrelated to flooding, or flood damage, and those STEP projects which are being carried out in a way that accomplishes two purposes, assisting initially the aged and infirm with clean-up work in the aftermath of flooding and providing employment to students, and then expanding on that to include exterior premises, clean-up and rehabilitation of properties flooded with the spring floods, and also using student employment. We can attempt to get some breakdown or breakout of the various projects, hopefully some time next week. In the meantime there are some I believe 18 telephone lines co-ordinated into the Student Placement Office in order to mount this program this weekend, starting today, tomorrow, Sunday, next week, to help in the clean-up of premises lived in by the elderly and the infirm. 774-6601, if my honourable friend wants to take a note of it, he can get all the information that he requires.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister inform us whether any discussions were held with municipal officials in affected areas concerning the priorities and the numbers of people, and did they have any say in the establishment of the particular STEP programs he's talking about.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, it is approximately ten days to two weeks ago that I requested the director of student placement of the STEP Program to draw up a tentative program and plan and discuss with the municipal officials the best means of implementing and co-ordinating the Student Manpower Program relating to flood rehabilitation and clean-up. Then yesterday in connection with the need to attempt to assist the elderly and infirm in basement dwelling premises clean-up, I met with representatives of the City of Winnipeg and made arrangement with them for their switchboards to relay all calls in the City of Winnipeg to the Student Manpower Placement Office.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister tell us whether the Provincial Government or the municipal governments are prepared to supply certain capital items, such as paint or other forms of materials, to help in the repair of some of the exteriors or interiors that have been damaged? Is there a capital assistance program for that to go along with the labour supply through STEP?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can advise my honourable friend that he is now referring not to Student Manpower services for clean-up, he is really referring to repair and costs of repair, which brings one directly into the formula of flood damage compensation. In that respect I can advise the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that yesterday between 12:00 o'clock and 2:30 in meeting with representatives of the City of Winnipeg, the Mayor and certain other representatives of the city, administrative as well, we did explore the administrative feasibility and eligibility of such repair costs. So that I believe it is today the City of Winnipeg is proceeding with the running of an advertisement in the two metropolitan papers, a survey for information purposes only type of advertisement, which contains a form asking people to indicate whether they've had basement damage, and if so the extent to which this has - a rough estimate as to how much is involved, and when that has been received back by the city administration there will be further communication with the province. In the meantime I have simultaneously, yesterday afternoon, sent a telegram to the Prime Minister requesting confirmation as to the eligibility of that kind of damage under the federal-provincial peacetime disaster compensation agreement.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, or the First Minister, whoever wants to answer. Again we're talking today about . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: All right. My question, Sir, is directed around the questions that have been discussed this morning which have been centered around the clean-up of basements. And again I want to put the question to the Minister--well I'll put it this way, I'll put it this way. The question is: is the body that have been travelling around the Province of Manitoba a couple of weeks ago assessing the flood damage, are they now reassessing since we've had excessive rain since that body went around the Province of Manitoba? And secondly, will they consider the fact that many farmers have put thousands of dollars into fertilizer onto their soil and it is now washed off. Is there going to be any compensation for these farmers who have lost thousands of dollars in fertilizer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is basically the same question that was asked yesterday by the Honourable Member for Arthur, at which time I replied that the honourable member is aware that on the 30th of April we passed an Order-in-Council that set out at great length the formula and the amounts of compensation available for - to compensate in whole or in part for damage caused to dwellings, farm buildings, cattle, seed grains, market garden inventory, etc, and that formula stands in place.

Now if my honourable friend is talking about soil saturation, that's one kind of problem which is not encompassed under any flood damage formula; and he is talking also about the possibility of excessive application of fertilizer being leached out of the soil, and there is no flood damage program that countenances that kind of problem.

The final point, as I understand, that he makes is that some of the designated flood areas have now had some reoccurrence, or a second flood, as it were within this 30-day period. The answer to that is simple. The municipal officials need advice, need only advise the Manitoba Water Resources Branch, Director Mr. Weber, or the branch personnel, and the machinery is in place to do a reassessment, if necessary and if deemed to be necessary or desirable in the view of the local municipal authorities.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 11 standing of the Carman Collegiate. They are under the direction of John Neil and Gerry Cleave. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for communications and ask him whether the government intends to move beyond the proposals in the area of cable television broadcasting and other fields that it made recently in the discussion paper presented to the CRTC, or whether the proposals contained in that discussion paper remain merely as academic proposals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry really asks two questions. One - are the plans suggested in the discussion paper academic? They are not academic, they are concrete proposals.

He asks also whether the government intends to move beyond those proposals. At the moment, Sir, I have nothing under consideration that would bring the government beyond those proposals.

But, Sir, I do hope that the two proposals made, one for the protection of the viability of Canadian broadcasting will be through the diversion of cable profits to all Canadian

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) broadcasters will be a proposal that is discussed in full in this province, and I would have reason to expect it will be discussed across the country.

And the second proposal of course for the telephone system to negotiate the full lease contract with the cable operators in 1979 after the existing contract has been honoured. That, Sir, I think would be something that would be of course open for negotiation at that time in 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the other day some honourable member opposite, I believe the Member for Assiniboia, had asked as to what arrangements and plans were being carried out by Emergency Measures Organization with respect to the possible reoccurrences of flood threat in certain places and communities in the province. In reply to that question I can indicate that subsequent to the torrential rainfall of last weekend in which 3.6 inches of rain fell in 36 hours, that Emergency Measures were reactivated and as a result direct information and advice was provided to all residents below a certain elevation level at Turnbull Drive and between really the Floodway inlet and St. Adolphe, and that as a result of that the information was made available to local residents, and as well all arrangements were made between Tuesday and yesterday for the available on standby of some 75 students under Emergency Measures Organization, and a number of troops, I believe, in the order of 200 or thereabouts. The water level is expected today I believe to reach some 761 feet which is about three feet, three and a half feet below the April 25, April 26 crest. So that's well in hand, Sir, I'm pleased to report.

And also the other, perhaps the other trouble spot in the province was at Halbstadt where there was need in the opinion of Emergency Measures to arrange for 25,000 sandbags to be taken in there along with additional flood fighting equipment. This has been done as well.

There was a lesser problem at Greta requiring a decision as to the cutting of a road. That's been done, and I think that brings us right up-to-date.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

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

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information regarding the Manitoba Animal Breeders Co-operative:

1. the names of the members of the Board of the Co-operative.
2. the amount of remuneration received by each Board member per meeting.
3. the number of meetings held during the year 1973-74, and the names of Board members present at each meeting.
4. the total salaries paid by the Co-operative.
5. the total operating expenses of the Co-operative.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management and House Leader) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the government is in a position of being required to decline this Order in that it deals with a co-operative established in the normal fashion of establishing a co-operative.

Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, we are aware that there is considerable public subsidy involved and the Minister would be willing to try to obtain, subject to the board of the co-operative objecting, some of the information that the honourable member wishes to have. Therefore it may be a moot question. The Minister is willing to obtain this information but as a matter of government policy we cannot say that we are required to give you the information of a private co-operative. Therefore if the honourable member will let the Minister try to obtain such information as he can and present it to him, it would not be a rejection of his intent but would be a stand on principle that we cannot hold the government responsible to giving information that the board of a co-operative might not wish to furnish.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. This is the sort of thing that we have been fearful of now for some time, that the government although they legislated this body into being becomes a responsibility of the government. The Minister now chooses to hide behind a body that he has set up. And this is a typical tactic on the part of the . . .

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find that we are now starting to debate whether we will or will not have this. Our procedure calls for, if it's rejected that it can be transferred for debate. --(Interjection)-- Would you like to have it transferred?

MR. JORGENSON: . . . proceedings now there is no opportunity to transfer . . . this motion for debate, and the Minister now because of this . . . refuses to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to accommodate the honourable member and it's possible that he has a point and that there should be a debate on this type of question. In the meantime I think that the honourable member wishes the information. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture is going to attempt to get it for him. I can tell the honourable member that there are numerous corporations that are set up by the Legislature under, let us say, bills establishing, let us say, the Guaranteed Trust Company in which we are unable to take the directive on the government to provide the information. But the honourable member has a good argument, a point of argument, and I am suggesting that in the meantime I think what he wants is the information, and that possibly in the next session the point at issue that the honourable member is referring to would be the subject of debate, or if there is still an opportunity under some of the procedures available to the House.

But in the meantime the Minister is willing to try to obtain the information that the honourable member requests and we would merely suggest that the order perhaps be referred for debate because technically that can be done and if the debate does not arise, at least the information will be provided and the subject matter which the Honourable Member for Morris wishes to debate will come up when the opportunity arises.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's acceptable to me as long as we get the information. It would be an interesting development if this information requested wasn't available, but as long as we get the information that's acceptable to us.

MR. SPEAKER: In the meantime are we transferring this Order for debate or not?

MR. JORGENSON: No. No point in transferring it for debate.

MR. GREEN: No. Okay. Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no desire very well. It will be stricken from the record.

Adjourned debate on second reading. Bill No. 58. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 65. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: That one stands, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 66

MR. SPEAKER: 66. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: I adjourned that for the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, having examined in some depth but not, because of lack of time, a complete examination which I would like to have carried out. I notice the one thing in this Act which to me has some significance, I think, and this is the fact that now The Highway Traffic Act will be brought under the Statute of Limitations in respect to the raising of the limit from one year to two. This can accommodate all those people who will be, might possibly because of government ineptness, lack of management, confusion and all other means that are used by government to delay paying people their legitimate claims - government has recognized that the monster they have created in Autopac cannot successfully operate within a twelve month period as far as claims are concerned and they are extending the period to two years.

Mr. Speaker, while this Act in essence extends the limit to two years for the time of legal action, does this really mean that what the government is doing is extending the period to two years for paying of legitimate bills of Autopac? Is the bureaucracy that has been created by the Minister responsible for Autopac so great that it's going to take two years to settle legitimate claims? Well, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the questions that the proceedings, or the subject matter of this bill raise in the minds of those that have had occurrence

BILL 66

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) to try and settle claims on Autopac. Mr. Speaker, there are changes occurring in the Autopac Bill, there are procedures announced by the Minister which have caused a great deal of concern in the eyes of the public of the province, concern that is legitimate, and the reason of extending the time for two years on limitation of act I think is probably still not going to be enough.

It wasn't too long ago, Sir, that I was informed by a person of a problem that existed in the area of Thompson where a citizen had purchased an automobile that was used for pleasure purposes only. This lady only lived a block from work. She walked to work all the time. That automobile, Sir, was involved in an accident which in the opinion of adjusters advocated that the automobile was not worth fixing, that the damage was of sufficient nature that it be considered a write-off.

There was no question of who was at fault in the accident, Mr. Speaker; the other person that was involved was apprehended and in fact detained, I believe, overnight, and was subsequently convicted of having an alcohol content in excess of .08. Sir, the other person involved in the accident was also an employee of Autopac. Subsequent to that, Sir, the person who had their automobile demolished was informed that Autopac would not pay the claim. So the limitation of action, Sir, I can understand may well go to two years, because of the political implications - limitations, Sir, 12 months. I believe, Sir, that 12 months will not solve this case. I don't know whether two years of limitation will solve this case, but I just use it, Sir, as an example of why the Limitation of Action should extend to two years.

I would hope, Sir, that that two year limitation is never used. I would sincerely hope that it never has to be used. I would hope that all actions of Autopac or any other agency are speedily rectified, but, Sir, I doubt if such is the case.

However, in making comment at this time I think it is essential that we recognize that the two year limitation has been extended in the field of automobile and highway, probably because of the great bureaucracy that has been built in this and the many problems that occur and the slowness that exists in a large bureaucracy. So for that reason I commend the Attorney-General for extending the time limit to two years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister in charge of Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After hearing the comments of the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, I just wondered whether he fell out of bed this morning, or what really had happened to him, because if I ever heard someone's speech go completely backwards, or in reverse to the intent of the bill, I've heard it this morning. What in effect the extension of the Limitations of Actions Bill provides, it really provides for the extension of time period for the claimant in the event that he has not filed a claim say for injuries against the Corporation that extends the time from one year to two years, not the reverse where the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell alleges that the corporation can sit on its hands and do nothing for two years before it has to settle the claim. It's exactly the reverse of what he has stated.

So that I don't know - if the honourable member does not want to give leeway for claimants in order that there may be some discrepancies and some problems arising out of possible medical reports and situations where the claimant's time expires before he puts in a claim, this will extend the time limit to two years. We have had instances where people have neglected, or through no fault of their own, to put in a statement of claim against the corporation where they were involved in an accident or personal injury, and we have had to waive that provision in many instances because we felt that the individual through no fault of his own made a claim after the Limitation of Action, limitation period had expired, and this will just extend the period that much longer for people who may come into difficulties.

But I don't know, the honourable member made some point about some case in Thompson, about the write-off of a vehicle. I would like the honourable member to give me some of those details if there was an employee of Autopac who was charged with impaired driving, if that is the case, the vehicle in question was written off, if we are talking about the same situation there was a possible breach of contract by the driver of the vehicle. Initially it was felt because the person, as the information was provided to me, had the car registered on preferred rates and should have been initially registered under business use. However, this was subsequently cleared up once more information was provided by the owner of the vehicle, and I

BILL 66

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) believe the claim, if it has not been settled, is in the process of being settled now. But with respect to the bill, I believe the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, got it completely backwards.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House - the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, we hesitate to doubt the exhortations of the Minister responsible for Autopac. The Minister is one of those new people in the Cabinet. We have to accept his word, and we want to do that because he gives the appearance of Mr. Clean, of being honest and sincere. But one of the problems of course is that he has been associated with the Minister of Finance, who fooled us last year when he made a certain claim on a certain bill and we find out that the intention of that bill was not as the Minister of Finance has stated, and so we can be forgiven, Sir, if from time to time we are a little bit reluctant to accept the statements of ministers opposite at their face value. If we make criticisms, we make them because we feel that there is a good reason for doing so and the Member for Birtle-Russell after examining this piece of legislation is not quite as sure as the Minister responsible for Autopac is, that all of the intentions behind this bill are as innocent as he proclaims.

QUESTION put and MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Concurrences?

CONCURRENCE

MR. PAULLEY: Concurrences, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it would be convenient to deal with the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolutions 57 to 63 separately, collectively, pass.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister was just going to make some comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh I didn't know the honourable member could read the Minister's mind.

A MEMBER: Well he adjourned the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry there was no adjournment.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Sorry, I just happened to walk in. My apologies, Mr. Speaker, but I wasn't able to get . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion I've had to speak on the Estimates of the Health and Social Development, and I don't want to take up the time of the House with a lengthy philosophic speech on the department itself. I do want to make a few comments though vis-a-vis the department, which I took over just on the eve of the opening of the session.

In doing so I want to acknowledge the efforts and the work done by people within the department. Firstly, the former Minister; secondly, Mr. Hans Schneider, who was deputy minister until just a couple of weeks ago and has now gone back to his first love, and for which he of course has a depth of experience, and that is the Secretary of Management, one of the more important positions within this government. But I can tell you very honestly that without his being present there when I took over, I certainly would have been at a complete and total loss. As well I want to thank the staff, departmental staff, for putting up with a Minister who does not know the details. When you come into a new department cold, especially when the Session's on, especially a department this size, you don't even know whom to phone to find information, and it's a big system, so that without the assistance of the staff - they've made my life bearable.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would permit me a moment. We have 80 students of Grade 5 standing from the Centennial School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Hoarst and Scharz and Zaborniak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Minister of Agriculture.

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

CONCURRENCE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I'll address myself really to the questions that were asked by members opposite.

The Member for Rhineland made a number of points. He did bring up, as did other members, the question of liaison and co-operation between the government and the providers of services, and he gave an example of nursing homes. I don't apologize for the fact that the nursing home program was launched last July 1st. Certainly I suppose there could have been more time taken in developing the program, and discussions with the nursing homes, nonetheless I'm not sorry we did it, it made possible for the first time in Manitoba access to homes, the rights to go into nursing homes which in the past was limited pretty well to people who either could afford it, or very often went in with a few dollars then stripped of their resources because of the 12, 14 dollars a day they had to pay, and then would end up as social allowance cases after their resources had been completely depleted.

The other element that could get in of course were those who were on social allowance in the first place. This has always been a vexatious matter. I know all members of the House felt that this wasn't the proper way to do it, and so I'm not pleased really that we were able to move towards making nursing homes available not on the basis of the financial situation which existed at the time, but based on need. Now we recognize that this has to be beefed up, and is in the process of being beefed up.

The suggestion is that somehow I blame MHSC when it comes to the matter of beds. I would like it understood that the Manitoba Health Services Commission is a Commission which is charged with the responsibility to deal with nursing homes and hospitals and doctors. They are a separate agency; they do not give me the details of their negotiations or discussions. Things only reach me long after they have met and come to certain conclusions and recommendations are sent forward to me, so I'm not privy to the day to day operations of the Commission whatsoever.

I would agree with the Member for Rhineland, and others who have spoken, that indeed one of the problems is that what we've had today, and the results that we're faced with today, we are suffering from the fruits of this kind of policy, is a policy established many years ago. Looking back one can be critical but in the light of the times perhaps it made sense that the concentrations was in acute care beds, treating people in acute care beds. The whole system was geared to that of treatment and curative approach rather than to a system of prevention, a system of intervention so it would not be necessary to resort to acute care in the final sense. And so the system is gradually being moved towards that of a comprehensive care, of progressive patient care to meet the needs of people as required and to treat them at the level that they need at the time that they first are made contact with. And to do that, you need a team approach, you need an approach not just by the doctors, but by the nurses, by the para-professionals, by all the health resources and social services resources of the community.

People's expectations and aspirations have risen in the last couple of decades, and in order to meet those aspirations and expectations we have to think in terms of total health, not just after someone becomes ill, but much earlier. And as a result, the focus of the department, the thrust of the department will be to develop such things as home care, as ambulatory care, as extended care, all the things that can be done, reasonably done, to keep the people in their own homes as long as possible, to keep them out of institutions; and if they do have to go into a hospital, to keep them as short a period of time so they can go back into their own home, their own community, where frankly I think it's healthier for them, and in the final analysis they'll become better that much quicker and they'll adapt into the community that much faster.

I know that there's been a great deal of talk about community clinics, and there are some who argue that before one launches anything, one has to be guaranteed that it is the answer, that it is a better answer than exists today. Mr. Speaker, if one is to wait until everything can be proved out in advance, I'm afraid we never would have moved anywhere. I recall the arguments about hospitalization back in the '50s, and there were many pros and cons and there were many arguments for and many arguments against - no-one could at that time sit down and prove conclusively to everyone's satisfaction that it was the right thing to do. And if we had waited until such a discussion took place and such proof was laid down to everyone's satisfaction, I don't think we'd have hospitalization today. The same applies to medicare. There were always people who had different views on it and again, if we had to wait until everything was tested out and argued out, then I don't think we'd have medicare today.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

The community health centre approach, the health and social service approach is an evolutionary matter. It is evolving across Canada, it is not confined to Manitoba only; it is now developing right across the country, every study in every province from B. C. to Newfoundland indicates a move in that general direction. And I predict, Mr. Speaker, that although today it is still a contentious issue and raises hackles and in some cases raises fears - I make a prediction that in decades to come we will accept, and society will accept, and all the health professionals will accept the fact that the team approach working in the primary care first, the preventative care into the treatment and then into the curative, will acknowledge the fact that the day of the private individual, whether he be a social worker, whether he be a nurse, whether he be a home economist, whether he be a doctor or a dentist or what have you, that they cannot and will not work in isolation, that they will have to approach this matter in total as a team to deal with the individual and not a piece of a person but rather as a whole. Because we are dealing with people and not machines where you can replace a part and put in another part, or tune up one part and let the rest go.

So that as I say, I make this prediction because I think that is the trend that is occurring right across the country. Home care is an essential component of that, and certainly that's an area where I'm pleased to see the oppositions agreeing is an important component. And we certainly intend to move in that direction to build up that expertise, again not just from the nursing aspect of it, but the full gamut of home care - the para-professionals who will come in, and because of their abilities and training can do some of the things to relieve medical people, can relieve nurses and can make it possible for the patient to spend the time in their homes and away from the need to go into a hospital.

Reference was made to a nursing shortage. I know that every year in the summertime, wards are closed down because nurses do go on holidays and want to go on holidays, because in the summertime most people prefer to have their holidays. If there is a need for more nurses - and certainly we'll be looking into this - and if there's a need, we will do everything possible to attract people, both male and female, into the nursing profession, so that the shortages that occur in the summer might be somewhat modified and may not affect the running of the hospitals. Of course keeping in mind too that doctors too want holidays and they too very often like to take their holidays in summer; if they're not there, then sometimes nurses notwithstanding various performances, procedures which take place in a hospital, do gear down or do slow down.

When looking at hospitals, we have to recognize that 62 percent of the costs are hospital costs, that's the most expensive single component. And I'm hoping that with discussions of health maintenance organization and others, that perhaps we can better utilize these very expensive facilities. And I still think that perhaps - they're operative from Monday to Friday, it's a five-day week, is it possible because of the heavy investment of manpower and capital in these facilities, that perhaps the hours can be extended; perhaps it shouldn't be a five day week, perhaps it should be; could be operated on for longer periods, perhaps six, maybe even seven days; which may mean staggered shifts, which may mean different timetabling of the operation itself, of the institution, a different approach to running it, but I think it's well worth looking into because I think it may be simply too expensive to operate on a simple five-day week basis. But of course that takes, firstly the study, then the co-operation of all involved - administration, staff at all levels, both professional and non-professional.

We feel that we have to be cautious about how we respond to the needs, and a number of studies have been made on what is the optimum number of beds - and by beds, I don't mean just acute care hospital beds, but beds generally - extended care nursing homes, the personal care homes at various levels - we've had a number of studies, we're now trying to develop guidelines.

These are not inscribed in stone or tablets by any means, they're guidelines to help the commission, the staff and the health organizations themselves to rationalize the system; and we believe that by these very studies, we have focused attention by people on the issues. And as a result in the months to come, that the imbalance if there is one will gradually correct itself as new facilities come on stream and home care comes into more effective play and is therefore felt, so that it in fact then affects the entire system.

Someone made reference to the foreign doctors not being utilized. Mr. Speaker, the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) whole question of foreign doctors - we have a number in Manitoba - they do come in here and they do practice. The reference suggested that they're not fully utilized, I'm not quite sure what was meant. I do know the doctors coming here from different countries where there are agreements, there's no problem at all as between certain countries and Canada. We're going to be expanding that so the doctors coming from the United States can now practice in Canada when they come in. In the case of certain countries, there's a requirement that certain tests be written before a doctor is permitted to do his internship and become a full-fledged doctor practising in Manitoba. Perhaps that can be looked at. I hope to discuss this matter with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, because certainly I agree that if someone is fully qualified, then they shouldn't be denied the right to practise. On the other hand, I have been told that in order to get the authority or the permission, the privilege of practising in Manitoba, they are required to write certain exams, both with regard to the language and their knowledge of medicine as is practised at the Canadian standard.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface spoke yesterday on certain aspects with regard to the government and the MMA. I believe however my colleague the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Studies replied to that one, so I won't repeat it nor will I belabour it. I just want to say this, that the relationship between the medical profession at the present time is good; a consultative mechanism has been established through the Manitoba Health Services Commission, who in the final analysis are the ones that deal with the doctors vis-a-vis fee schedule and related matters. They have got a consultative mechanism, they have been meeting; the subjects discussed can be put forward either by the MMA or by the MHSC, and these consultations take place. Similarly, the MMA knows that if they wish to discuss with me any facet of the problem they may have or think they have, they are always free to do so, recognizing of course that consultation does not mean concurrence. We can discuss, we can share points of view, we can compare notes; in the final analysis of course, the government as every government has to eventually make a decision vis-a-vis general health policy, and we'll have to do so. But I concur that consultation is ideal, not just with the medical profession but the nursing profession, the social workers, all the health professionals that go into the entire spectrum of health in its broadest sense, because that is really what we are trying to do. We're trying to deliver a single unit delivery system, so that people are treated by someone or dealt with by someone who can meet their problem best - that may be a doctor, it may be a psychologist, it may be a homemaker, you know, even a homemaker can do a great deal to make it possible for a person to continue a normal existence and avoid as long as possible from having to be hospitalized.

The question of the number of hospital beds and what is the optimum, that is a matter of - just of opinion. There is a general feeling across Canada that one should strive for about 4-1/2; in Quebec I believe . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might prevail upon the honourable members to hold their private conversations outside. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is a difference of opinion, although it's finally coming - I think being resolved - as to what constitutes a number of beds that are optimum; in Quebec, I believe 3-1/2 is what they're targeting for; someone said that here we have something like 3.7 - I don't know where those figures are arrived at. I believe our figure's somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5 beds per capita, which puts us in line generally with other provinces in Canada.

The Member for St. Boniface stressed the point that we have very fine medical specialists in Manitoba and certainly we wouldn't want to lose them. I concur in that, I don't think we have lost any. I think there are generally more doctors practising in Manitoba today than last year and more last year than the year before. On the other hand I make a prediction, I predict that the trend towards the exclusive specialization which developed in the immediate post-war period is waning, and family practice and family care practice is going to take on more and more importance as everyone in the health field recognizes the need for greater preventative medicine, and it's only in the preventative field that the family practitioner or the general practitioner as he might be called can play an important role. And I predict that in the months and the years to follow that this is going to be happening; the primary care is going to become more important in the scheme of things as everyone recognizes the need for these things.

The question was raised about the 8 percent of the MHSC, the Health Services Commission

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) had imposed on the hospitals, and this figure was arrived at months ago when budgets were being discussed. The hospitals, as I indicated in the question period during the session, have the mechanism of an appeal to the Health Services Commission if they feel that the amount that was allocated to that hospital or budget for the hospital is inadequate. And we are in a period of rapid inflation where from one month to the next changes took place which were not known to the Commission earlier in the summer or late fall, and these appeals are being heard and will be heard and I have no doubt in my mind that the Health Services Commission will deal with them fairly and will recognize needs and respond to needs if they can be justified. There was some criticism of an eight percent imposition, when in fact the department was itself going beyond the eight percent in its own expansion of costs. But we mustn't lose sight of the fact that we have launched a nursing home program which now we have to pay for for an entire year; the pharmacare program, supplement to the elderly, day care programs, programs in mental retardation of a substantial nature. The Health Services Commission's costs themselves are up around, I think it's \$39 million. We are moving more strongly in the field - hope to be moving in the field of detoxification, and there's some moneys there, so although our costs have risen beyond that of the eight percent mentioned, it is because we are launching new programs, programs which we feel are in response to needs of people, and programs which I think are receiving the support of the general public.

A question was raised about the capital cost-sharing by municipalities and the requirements of the 20 percent, I think if I recall correctly, 20 percent that the municipality or the hospital district has to raise in the construction of a hospital. The ten percent I think it is for nursing homes. I agree that this is a long-standing practice. I think we now have to examine these, but I would caution members and remind members that when and if the government moves to - if it should move in the direction of eliminating that requirement, then you have to recognize that to all intents and purposes these institutions then become total provincial institutions. The operating costs are completely paid for from Consolidated Revenue, and if the capital costs are also absorbed completely by the government then I think we have to sort of go to the next logical step and ask ourselves, is the long-standing existing idea that hospitals are private autonomous institutions that run themselves, operate themselves, answer to themselves, and through a board, whether that really is relevant in today's world.

They came into being in a different period and at a different time. And if we move towards covering more and more of their costs, we've taken over all the operating costs, and now also take over all their capital costs whether in fact the rationale for continuing what may be almost a facade of so-called autonomy and independence, is in fact real or imaginary. That doesn't mean that the government simply moves in and runs every hospital, but it does mean that perhaps we have to look at the nature of the board, the make-up of the board, whether in fact it's representative of the community, whether it's a self-perpetuating board which came into being 30, 40 years ago because of a few - the ability to raise funds in the private sector, but those days are gone.

So those are questions which I think we have to address ourselves to. I don't have pat answers for them. I don't claim to. Some of you who know me know that I never claim to have these pat answers to anything. But I think these are the sort of things that the department will have to consider and address itself to, and the Legislature will have to deal with in time to come.

The Member for Fort Garry brought up a case which I knew nothing about, the Greff Lab. Fortunately I couldn't get to sleep last night and so I happened to at 1:00 o'clock in the morning run across the newspaper article where it referred to the fact that a recent court decision, very recent because it was in yesterday's paper, had dismissed the charges against this particular lab, and the member asked me what are we going to do about it - well not me, what is the MHSC going to do about it. I am not going to try to give him a legal opinion but I imagine if the charges were dismissed then I suppose this individual, like every other citizen, has a right to sue and to claim any moneys which he may have been deprived of in the light of the dismissal of the charges. But of course that's up to him and his solicitor, who I don't doubt he will now be consulting with now that he has had the case dismissed, or the charges dismissed.

The Member for St. James did ask me about a case which has been brought to his attention. It is not a usual case, it's a very odd one, dealing with certain amendments to Bill 63 last year and regulations which apparently have not been brought forward as a result of that,

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) dealing with the case of an individual who would rather stay in his own home given a certain amount of support, so it would be possible for him to do so. I would agree with the Member for St. James that that's one of the things we have to look at if we're really trying to keep people out of institutions, and if we're talking in terms of keeping people within their own homes and making it possible to function as independently and for as long as possible. I can assure the member that because of this particular incident he brought to my attention and others that are similar, different and yet similar in nature, that the department will be looking very carefully at what can be done to make it possible for people to stay within their own homes, with their own families very often, with just giving them that extra support needed so they don't have to go to institutions, even though they might qualify, because they are better off mentally, emotionally, if they can stay amongst their own friends and family.

The Member for La Verendrye brought up the question of a letter which had been introduced originally by the Member for Birtle-Russell, a form letter sent out by the Health Services Commission to the personal care homes, I believe it was. What they read into it is - and I've checked with the Health Services Commission - what they read into it is that this is an attempt by the Commission to force every personal care home to enter into a negotiated agreement with their staffs. I am told this is not the case at all. The Manitoba Health Organization working together with the Manitoba Health Services Commission has come up with salary scales for various levels of personnel in a personal care home, that's clerical, administrative, maintenance, dietary, and so on, kitchen staff, and they use that figure in determining what are the salaries paid. I am told that this therefore is in line with what is actually being paid. Where there is an agreement, where there happens to be an agreement, and it's a negotiated one, of course those are very definitely part of an agreement which the institution has to meet. But that the others are really not that far off, and they're arrived at in consultation with the Manitoba Health Organization and therefore they represent what is the going rate in these nursing homes at the present time. But certainly there is no desire, no intent and no pressure applied or otherwise by myself personally, or by the Commission, to force any group into unionizing - I have to tell you personally that it's entirely up to the people involved. We have no desire to push them into that.

Nursing homes of course is a very new operation, it's simply still being refined, and perhaps by the next time around a more effective way of dealing with the budgets of nursing homes will have been developed as the program, as a better understanding of the program takes place and more experience is gained in that field.

The Member for Fort Rouge talked about housing as he very often does, and he does identify two major areas of high mortgage rates - that is the cost of capital - and land as the villains of the piece. He says, where is Manitoba's policy? The Federal Government is doing all it can. Well I hate to disappoint him. He talks about co-ops, and the Member for Fort Garry likes to talk about co-ops, and you know we had three co-op plans well on their way and out of the clear blue sky we are now informed by CMHC that they are prepared to fund one in 1974, and would we put the other two on the hot - just on the back plate, on the back burner, because they don't have the funds for this year. They have determined how much they're going to spend in that field. He then suggested that Manitoba should use the pension fund, so that its employees for example, MGEA, and maybe the Teachers Retirement Fund, and make funds available at maybe six percent, or some very low percentage, to prospective homeowners so they wouldn't have to pay these high rates. I'm not sure how the people who contribute to these pension funds, the teachers and the civil servants, and others, would feel about not getting the best return for the moneys that they put into the pension fund because in the final analysis it is going to affect the pension fund and the yield from which their benefits flow. Manitoba does on the other hand . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell us what the yield on the pension funds now are? Are they above six percent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Sure they're higher. They're higher, they must be higher.

A MEMBER: Oh come on.

MR. MILLER: Of course they are. Well, Mr. Speaker, when the same pensions funds are used to buy hydro, an issue of hydro bonds, and an issue of Manitoba Telephone System

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MILLER cont'd) bonds, then naturally they are higher because Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone bonds are now yielding more than six percent, considerably more.

I can tell the honourable member this. He mentioned the fact that the province should release the land that it owns for immediate house building. You know I wish we had as much land - I wish we had more land to release. You can't release land where there is no infrastructure. If there is no sewer and there is no water, the land can't be released for housing. It can't be built upon. Where the MHRC does own land, and where that land can be put to immediate use, I can assure the member every effort is being made to try to get that on to the market. We're working with the City of Winnipeg to get the necessary zoning changes. After the zoning changes we have to wait for approval of a plan of subdivision itself. These things are going forward. I can tell the member that we are prodding the City of Winnipeg to move as quickly as possible into getting these agreements. We have to go through the community committee hearings, as the member knows. These things do take time, but I can assure the member that if there's any land that the province does hold, any land holding which can be developed in 1974 will be developed, and I am going to make a prediction that for 1975 with the co-operation of the City of Winnipeg we're going to be able to put on the market a lot more land, serviced land than ever before.

I think in the final analysis that is the answer to the shortage of homes. It's not a matter of inducing someone to build by giving him a special tax, capital gains relief, or somehow giving him a housing allowance so that he will let people in of low income. If you're going to lick the housing problem then your housing stock has to be adequate, and that I think is the only answer. If you have enough housing stock then those who believe in the supply and demand, and in this case I certainly do, if you get enough housing stock the supply is there, the demand will ease up, the pressure will ease up, the pressure will ease up, and the prices, if they don't fall, because I don't think prices ever do fall, but at least they may level off and ease off somewhat. But the pressure on the cost of land itself may certainly be affected and the pressure on the demand will certainly be affected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. MILLER: The latest purchase of the pension fund, the most recent ones was 10 percent. That was the yield. --(Interjection)--But it's today's market, Mr. Speaker. The suggestion was to take money out of the pension fund today and make it available to the private sector at six percent or some very reasonable percentage. What I'm saying is today the pension fund is investing at ten percent, and I just can't see why the employees who contribute to the pension fund, whether they be teachers, or civil servants, or what have you, should have to underwrite the shortfall between the six and the ten. I say this to the Member from Fort Rouge, the Federal Government was asked, was urged, was pleaded with, to make moneys available and to ask the banks, to tell the banks that as a condition of operating in Canada they had a responsibility to everyone that they should set aside, the bank should set aside a certain amount of money at a reasonable mortgage rate of about six or seven percent for housing. The banks - I don't know if the Government even asked them; I know the banks aren't doing it. I'm not even sure the government asked that, so when the Member for Fort Rouge talks about a social problem, I suggest that that social problem is there. I also suggest that the banks have responsibility, and the Federal Government has a greater responsibility to make sure that the banks try to meet that responsibility.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Estimates of the Minister involve approximately 35 percent of the total budget of the province. And it's rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the nature of our rules and the way in which this Session has developed, prevents what I think was necessary for this year - and I'll come back in a moment - understandable from the government's point of view as far as procedure is concerned, prevents the kind of review that should be taking place of the whole host of programs that the Department of Health and Social Development are involved in. Now I appreciate the fact that the Minister was appointed just a few days before the Session and obviously was not acquainted with the Estimates of the Department, and had only a familiarity with some parts of the departmental activity. And I appreciate that and I recognize that. And I also appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the efforts that the Minister has put forward in the responsibilities that he's undertaken prior to this particular department. But having said that, and having expressed some faith in his ability and responsibility, that does not in any way take away from what I think has to be levelled as a very serious charge of mismanagement and lack of leadership on the part of the government in dealing with this department over the years. Because this department, Mr. Speaker, has been a department surrounded by or characterized by confusion, by lack of planning, lack of leadership; essentially not meeting the needs in many areas, even though the policy announcements appear to suggest that they were, and not developing as I believe it should have in certain areas of responsibility.

Now let's deal with the department to recognize that the Department of Health and Social Development involves the whole health care field, involves the social development field, which at one time was considered to be only the welfare field in that sense; involves the whole penal reform and rehabilitation field. And in addition, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has the added responsibility of being in charge of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. So without question, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a department and about a Minister who is the most powerful Minister in the Provincial Government; powerful in the sense of the programs that he deals with - deal with the people of the province in different aspects and in the main deal with to a large extent those people who are in a disadvantaged situation with respect to the economy and with respect to our society. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, the criticism will be levelled in a general way today because we are not going to be in a position to deal with the specifics, as the procedures prevent us from dealing with those specifics; it is not levelled against the Minister per se in his own right as the Minister, because he's only taken over the responsibility, and he and I both know that as of the day the Session is finished, his work is cut out as he tries to get hold of a department that has been allowed to run wild, really, for a substantial period of time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that I could tell the Minister of Finance that if we were in a position in a committee, formed to ask for witnesses to come forward, to call hundreds, literally hundreds of witnesses who have had contact with the Department of Health and Social Development in any particular program who would indicate the kind of confusion, the kind of backtracking, the lack of management, with respect to the way in which the programs have been handled, dealing with their particular concern. As a matter of fact, I don't think there is anybody who has touched this department in the last few years who has worked in the Social Service field that has anything good to say about the department or the way in which it has handled its responsibilities, because the problem that they always faced was they were not sure what the government's intentions were - it was not clear at the top in terms of the policy decisions. And the result is, the people whom they had contact with in the department were not capable of conveying to them, you know, the final determination or decision or to indicate the direction, and this has added to the frustration generally of the agencies and people who have had to deal with the government. And the Honourable Minister and the members who have some familiarity with this know that what I am saying is true, and it's a difficult thing for them to admit it, I don't expect the government to admit it; in fact they'll defend it, and they'll attack me and they'll attack the opposition. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are involved in the field know it to be true; and the fact is that this alienation - and that's what I would use, the term, Mr. Speaker - this alienation is something that the Minister has to try and correct, and I know that he is going to try. But the fact is, why was it allowed to happen? And why didn't the government act on this when it understood it? And why did the Premier allow this thing to develop and continue as he did,

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) and why did it take him so long to make the decision that was necessary which was to change the Ministers and to reorganize?

Now I can demonstrate this in any one of the particular fields. If we talk about health in a general way, I could document - and the members opposite know that - the statements that are in contradiction, made by the Manitoba Health Services Commission, made by the government Minister, made by the Deputy Minister, made by the working group of the Health White Paper - and the honourable members opposite know that that can be done.

I could take the rehabilitation field, and I could again look at the statements of the Minister, the policy statement on the rise of the sparrow; and in turn the actual program that was undertaken and has been undertaken and the direction that's been given and in terms of the whole social service field. In specifics I could deal with it and in general I could deal with it, and members opposite know that. The problem here is that - and this has been probably the general complaint of the government - is that in this area the clear direction was never given to those who were involved in the execution of policy as to what should be done. And the problem of course, is that there was confusion among the members opposite as to what direction they really wanted and, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that that policy decision has been resolved. And notwithstanding the ability that the Honourable Minister may have of trying to bring back those who had contact with the department to a point where they can be participants and feel that they are part of a total program to assist and help our society, that until the government resolves its position, it's going to be very difficult.

Now we've seen at least some evidence that in the Health field there is now an attempt to try and resolve some of the problems that we've had, with the appointment of the new Deputy; with the fact that the former Member for St. Boniface is now the Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and is now executing a policy that's obviously been determined by the government and is carrying out what the government wants at this point. And the fact that there is an attempt to try and sort of bring it to a point, where those who are charged with the responsibility execute what they're supposed to be doing because the decisions and policy matters have been resolved by the government. But having said that, there is no way in which this government can be commended for the years of waste and the lack of progress in many areas.

And this is the difficulty in dealing with the estimates this year, because if we are to examine the specific programs, listen to the statements that have been made, or read on the record the statements that have been made over the years on the particular matters, we would find that it is not as represented; that the programs themselves require serious review to really be in a position to assess whether they are reaching the need that has been identified; and whether it in fact accomplishes the objective, and whether . . . Mr. Chairman, we talk about Day Care Centres and the Day Care Program, which sounds very good, but when we analyse it, we'll find, Mr. Speaker, that it really has limitations, limitations caused to a large extent by Federal Government participation and the unwillingness of the government to go beyond that participation and the unwillingness of the government to go beyond that participation. Whether we talk in terms of the programs for alcoholic rehabilitation, whether we go onto the programs, Mr. Speaker, relating to the nursing home care program, we will find still at this point, Mr. Speaker, the lack of decision on policy matters preventing the execution of policy. And in turn we will find by close examination, it can be pointed out that the programs are not meeting the essential requirements and needs, nor are they meeting the lofty ideals expressed by the government and by the Ministers in the past and even by the Premier.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to concur - or we can object, and we're not going to object - but we're going to concur with the Department of Health and Social Development, with a caveat that up till now, the programs that have been undertaken have not achieved the objectives that the honourable members opposite would like to believe. Mr. Chairman, in addition, that instead of really addressing themselves over the last few years to the problems of a whole host of people from whom they claim they had a special mandate - and I refer to the disadvantaged - they have, because they were afraid to tackle the problems and afraid to make the changes that were necessary, Mr. Chairman. They have allowed these people to have minimum benefits as opposed to the kind of higher benefits they would have received, had the kind of direction been given and had they been honest with themselves as to how the department was

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) operating. And they all know that, Mr. Speaker. They know very well that over the last few years those were wasted years for the New Democratic Party.

Now they can stand up, Mr. Speaker, and they will cite one program after another and say, we've done this, we've done this, and we've done more than the previous government. Of course they've had more money, Mr. Speaker, there's more revenue coming in, so they're in a position to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, they know as well, that in spite of all that they can claim that they've done, much more could have been done, would have been done, had there been the leadership given both by the Premier in handling of Cabinet and in the policy decision making - and Mr. Chairman, by the Minister, who should have been replaced several years before. And the Honourable Minister of Finance can chirp all he wants from his seat, yeah, but he knows that it's true. If the Honourable Minister of Finance is satisfied that they've done all they can and that they have in fact been, you know, credible with respect to the kind of commitments that they made then, Mr. Chairman, I say to them that there is not very much, you know, there is not very much esteem that I can hold them in because, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated they had that special mandate.

You know, if we look at any of the programs, the program for the senior citizens in terms of the mini income program, we find that while they say that there will be a mini income given of \$200 for those who are on income supplement or on the guaranteed income supplement - we find that when the couples, when there is an older couple, married, who are qualified, that the wife does not apply, does not receive the same 200, the 200 is only for single, it's less as a married couple. Yet this is not the case in B.C. Why didn't they do that? When the food component of the welfare amount was raised, the government raised that amount to equal the percentage increase of the cost of living, which was about 50 percent less than the actual rise in the cost of food. Now let's understand this. This government, who claims it has a mandate for the disadvantaged, when it raised the food component of welfare - and only the food component - it raised it to equal the increased cost of the cost of living under the terms of a percentage basis, but not the increased cost of food. And when that was pointed out to the government, well obviously, either an error has been made on their part - was there an admission on their part that an error had been made and a correction made? No, they've let it remain as it has. This is the party who stands up for the disadvantaged, and this is the party that stands up as a party reform. And so when I suggest to the honourable members opposite that I don't hold them in great esteem with respect to this department, I can cite example after example of what I consider has been an attempt to pass off the language of reform and the concern for the disadvantaged, but in reality to have operated and been controlled by what would be considered the minimum kind of requirements they can get away with in almost everything that they've done. And so, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to concur in this Health and Social Development estimate, but I must say it's with regret that we did not have the opportunity for the kind of analysis that should have been undertaken with respect to this department, which would have I believe exposed them in the way that I believe they have acted in the last little while.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make two other points. We have one amount of \$136 million in the Manitoba Health Services Commission; we're asked to approve that particular amount. Now I ask the honourable members opposite, what do we really know about the Manitoba Health Services Commission? And I wonder, what do they know about the Manitoba Health Services Commission? What do they know about how the money is spent?

Now I am aware that there is a report that's produced, and I'm aware that there's an auditor's report that says that it will be according to the records of the book. But I want to ask the honourable members opposite as a government, who are now asking us to pass \$136 million, what we really know about that, what kind of expense account, expenses, do we know about. How much money has been involved in research? How much money has been paid by way of fees to doctors, fees to others? We know nothing, yet we're asked to pass this. And I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that in this day and age, with the estimates being what they are and the escalation of costs being what they are, that this form is good enough - that one line is all that really is required on our part to pass and approve essentially one phase of government activity in this department, one Crown Agency, whose information we know very little about, and we are unable to deal with, Mr. Speaker. We're asked to

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd). . . . approve \$136 million on the basis of the good intentions of the government. Ah yes, because we know nothing about it, and as a matter of fact they know nothing about it, realistically. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact that it was set up certainly doesn't bother me, because I don't care how it was set up. I'm saying today that in this day and age, in this Legislature, in the House of Commons, in the provinces, there is no way that you can deal with these matters Mr. Speaker, without the equivalent of Public Accounts to be able to deal with this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: --(Interjection)-- Well I want to tell the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, I've said this now for about two years --(Interjection)-- Oh, you've never heard that. Well, I'm sorry I said that two years - and I can recount all. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please. Order Please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I must tell you something, I'm quite prepared to report - I've said this for two years. But, Mr. Speaker, I want it quite understood that I want the Manitoba Health Services Commission on that basis, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation on that basis, the Manitoba Development Corporation on that basis; Mr. Speaker I want the Universities on that basis - it's necessary for the Crown corporations and agencies to be put on this basis, for very good reason. This is \$136 million; the universities was \$45 million, the Manitoba Development Corporation in its capital items will be 40 to 50 million dollars --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about, and what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources may not be aware, is I want the equivalent of public accounts for the Manitoba Health Services Commission. --(Interjection)-- The MDC has not given us the equivalent of public accounts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: When the MDC appears before committee, are the honourable members not entitled to ask for every figure of expenditure for an accounting of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a member of the Legislature being in a position to examine as a result of a written documentation presented to them, the Public Accounts of the Manitoba Development Corporation, the Manitoba Health Services Commission. You know, the fact that a Legislative Committee may meet and the fact that certain questions may be asked is not the same, Mr. Speaker, as having it all documented so that we can examine and review it in our own way.

And that refers to the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation. You know, Mr. Speaker, because I would want to know how the government spent \$500,000 on the renovations of the new office in a senior citizens home, why it remained for a year and a half? I will want to know what the justification was for moving the offices in a senior citizens home instead of building 14 or 15 or 20 senior citizens accommodation. I mean I would want to have the government justify to me that this was in the best interest of the state, this was in the best interest of the people of the province, that this in fact was to the advantage of the people of the province, and wasn't just a bureaucratic dream of some planners who essentially felt that they would like a fine accommodation. I'd like to know why it took a year and a half for the members to move in - for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to move in.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk in terms of the equivalent of Public Accounts, I would be able to make some assessment because those figures would be a matter of record of what rentals have been paid --(Interjection)-- Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister says we could always get that, well maybe we can, maybe we can't. We could ask for an Order for Return, or an Address for Papers, and we may or may not --(Interjection)-- or in Oral Questions - we may or may not get an answer. In the case of Address for Papers and Orders for Return, Mr. Speaker, now how many do we get a reply to - 20 percent? 25?

A MEMBER: All of them.

MR. SPIVAK: No, that's not true, that's not true, and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows that to be the case. We can document how untrue that is. We have not received the information. When will we receive it, Mr. Speaker? A year later? A year and a half later? Two years later? What I'm talking about now is that in dealing with this particular estimate as we have to deal with the others, there is not the kind

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd). . . . of information available to give us the ability to be able to get the kind of accounting that we should. So, Mr. Chairman, we have to pass at this point \$271 million based on two day's debate - with not even two days debate - with limited information, with a government who expresses good intentions but who has demonstrated, I think, a lack of management in the last little while, with no information available, and, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the session, and this was probably the most important department of government. Mr. Speaker, this was probably the one department of government in which a debate, a serious debate, a serious debate on every aspect of the departmental activity would have been important to the people of this province this year. Because, Mr. Speaker, it would give them the opportunity for the differences in philosophy to be expressed, for constructive criticism to be offered. It would also have provoked what I think was necessary, which would have been the publicity related to this, so that those people who are affected would be able to write the Ministers, or write ourselves, because the matter would be debated in the House to indicate the problem areas. And so, Mr. Speaker, in many respects we have been deprived of that debate, and so has the province, and the province has lost.

Now does anyone think that it's just an accident that the new Minister of Health and Social Development was appointed just a few days before the session started. That could have been predicted months before, for a very good reason. They tried it with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Minister of Industry and Commerce on the Manitoba Development Corporation. When the government realized that they had to take it away from him and put it to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources they did it before the session, and therefore all the Minister could do was honestly state that he was unfamiliar with this, he would bring it to the attention, and marks my impression of what he said. That's my impression of what he said, that's my impression of what he said, Mr. Speaker.

I think, you know, Mr. Speaker, I think I can basically --(Interjection)-- I think I can. My impression, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister basically took the position that he was new to the department, and that he would have to get the information, he didn't have it readily available. --(Interjection)-- Well that's often the case, but Mr. Speaker, does anyone understand what really took place then? The pressure was off, and the pressure was off on health and social development. So in effect as a result of the strategy maneuvered by the government, and as a result I think of deliberate planning and deliberate policy, we are not going to be in a position to debate probably the most important estimate, one which spends in terms of the dollars the most amount of money, one in which there is really a lack of information as far as this House is concerned, and one in which the records are really not available for the analysis that was required.

So, Mr. Speaker, our problem at this point is to say to the government if there was no strategy of this then I would hope that the first estimate, as the Minister suggested, that would be brought up next year would be the Department of Health and Social Development and I would hope that we would have that --(Interjection)-- Beg your pardon? And I would hope that the opportunity would be given for the kind of review that should be undertaken. Because, Mr. Speaker, there are just too many people who have been involved in the various aspects of this department, whose concerns have been expressed to the members opposite, whose point of view, and who have also expressed positions to the government, but its frustration with the government has not given them the opportunity for an expression of the opinions so that there can in fact be a legitimate debate which can be constructed in assisting and helping them to be able to improve the departmental activities.

I wish the Minister, and I know he's absent and I know he had to leave, and he acknowledged that to me. But I wish him well. I don't think his task will be easy, I don't think his task will be easy. I think the legacy of what he has is going to be very difficult to overcome, and I hope that he is going to be able to convince the members opposite to start to remember part of the mandate that they claim for themselves. In their attitude with the people whom, the whole host of people whom they deal with, who have been put in - who are in the disadvantaged position, that they will at least find the degree of compassion from the government that has not been exhibited in many areas, and in many concerns that the government has had to deal with. I would hope that they would find from the government a response which would not suggest because there's an objection that the person who, or the organization, or the group, is automatically an enemy of the government, and one in which the government

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd). . . . is immediately in a confrontation with, and one in which the government must therefore sustain its position rather than deal with people's problems, and try and assist, and try and help, and try to provide for them the improvement in the quality of life that they claim that they themselves have taken as one of their basic objectives in political life.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I had thought that I would wait before I spoke until I found out whether the real spokesman for the Conservative Party on welfare matters was going to speak but I asked him, and the Member for Pembina indicated he was not prepared to speak. --(Interjection)-- So that while - he may yet, that's fine, then he will respond to me, and I will find it difficult -- well of course impossible to respond to him on this debate.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a rather typical presentation by the Leader of the Opposition, a great deal of wind and very little meaningful contribution. He spoke about, towards the end, about the difficulty in debating this matter; that really there was no time. One would think that we didn't have a Throne Speech; one would think that we didn't have a Budget Speech, where he had unlimited time. One would think that he didn't have opportunities where he could throw papers on the floor, booklets on the floor, all sorts of material on the floor. One would think they didn't have opportunities to come in on a Friday morning - which today is - and throw exposed bombshells - I forget his expression - but break it, as if he didn't have an opportunity to break things before the House, and the poor, unfortunate Leader of the Opposition did not have the opportunity to discuss health policy. What he says is the most important department of government as far as the services to the people, the poor, unfortunate Leader of the Opposition couldn't discuss it, all he could today was talk about it, and around it, but not talk "it". As a result he said, I could, I could bring documentation; I could bring --(Interjection)-- Oh he said, yes he could; no doubt he could. I could too, anybody could. When you deal with a department of that size, there are all sorts of both commendation, recommendation and very little commendation from him because he has no desire whatsoever to find commendation. He would much rather jabber as he does from his seat and he criticized me for that. He would much rather be able to keep talking while he's seated than be able to make a positive contribution. Because the fact is that the person who is labelled as the spokesman for the Party, the honourable member who spoke first for the Party on this matter did talk about positive things. He did question certain things, he did make a contribution.

The Leader of the Opposition not only did not make a contribution to the discussion on this department, he didn't even make a contribution to his own Party's profile on this picture except to criticize some very minor things. But he made a number of generalizations of all kind; he brought in the Minister of Mines who has been responsible to report on the MDC for some time, and claimed that the Minister of Mines was appointed in such a way that he could avoid discussion on the MDC - an absolutely impossible suggestion to accept because we all sat here and listened to the Minister of Mines discussing the MDC last year at great length, because he was the first one I believe on the Estimates, and at great length --(Interjection)-- he tells me 30 hours were spent discussing the matters that come under his responsibility. I know that he revealed - he brought before the House all sorts of information which had never been made available before, but there is certain items he refused to discuss or report on because they were more of a company nature itself. So to use that as an example is typical of the broad brush stroke of the Leader of the Opposition.

For example, Mr. Speaker, he talked now about a pension increase that had been passed; he talked now of the relationship between cost of living, the increase in cost of living and the increase in the cost of food, and he ignored the fact that this particular matter was one which was brought in at a time when we decided that we would - what's the term - index, we would index the payments and we have announced the indexation.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, that's why I wanted to know whether the member for Pembina was going to speak, because, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that if the Member for Pembina was going to speak on that issue, or any other welfare issue, there would be no consensus whatsoever between the two of them. That's why I regret that we did not hear from the Honourable Member from Pembina, who I believe, who I believe --(Interjection)-- no, I

CONCURRENCE

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd). . . . won't say he's the leader but I would say he speaks for the majority of his caucus, that I would say, and that I would say with a feeling of certainty.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on the Health Services Commission and on the hospitals. And I heard, I think it was the Member for St. Boniface yesterday, but I heard a member of the Liberal caucus say that we ought to take over the complete administration of the hospitals in the Province of Manitoba. The Member for St. Boniface is nodding, so I did attribute it to him correctly. Mr. Speaker, that is a very important suggestion that he made and I somehow feel that that is what the Leader of the Opposition was suggesting. That's the way I interpreted what he was saying when he was talking about the Health Services Commission coming in and being fully accountable, which means, of course, fully accountable for policy and being fully accountable for what goes on in the hospitals. Mr. Speaker, we have hospital boards throughout this province. Every hospital, even the municipally operated hospitals come under boards, and either those boards are accountable to the people who appoint them or if government is, then government has to take the responsibility not only of enunciating policy but of seeing to it that policy is carried out in the various hospitals.

Then the question arises, if that's the case, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear, I know absolutely nothing other than what I read in the newspaper about any discussions with Misericordia Hospital. The last couple of days there have been discussions, doctors in the hospital have been upset about certain statements; Mr. Speaker, I do say this, I know nothing whatsoever about those discussions that are referred to. But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know whether it is felt that government, or the Health Services Commission, or a board, as now is the practice, should make decisions on the Misericordia Hospital. Because it is that kind of discussion which is meaningful, because government should be in a position to know, what do the elected people feel. You know, we have more and more difficulty finding out - at least I do - what the Conservative Party feels about various issues.

When we make decisions here, we hear criticisms but we do not very often hear a positive suggestion, and that means that a number of people who are elected to sit in this Chamber are not prepared to make a positive suggestion, a concrete suggestion about what should be done; they are more inclined to criticize. And that's why I say that the Member for St. Boniface yesterday made a positive suggestion; at least I get a feeling that St. Boniface, the people who elected the St. Boniface representative, both present and preceding, and possibly potential, do have representatives that do feel that there should be greater involvement.

Now the Leader of the Opposition, I don't know whether he wants to bring them before a Royal Commission, which is one of his favorite methods of reviewing policy, to be cross-examined, or to carry on discussions about what should be the kind of policy that should be done.

Because Mr. Speaker, when he was a member of the Cabinet and sitting on this side, I don't think the Health Commission even appeared in the budget. I don't believe it was ever a matter that came in dollars before the estimates' review. I suppose we could have discussed them, and did, under the Minister's salary. The item wasn't even there because it was kept separate. It was kept out of the estimates altogether. Well we eliminated the Conservative premium tax, then we brought it right in to the estimates and we're showing the full payment by the province into the -- I've been saying Health Services. I should have said Medicare. There was no Health Services as such until we came into government.

But the Medicare was not even in the estimates at all. Now they are here, now the Minister is accountable, now the Minister has to answer when the opportunity is presented. This year it was unable to be done. Next year I'm sure it will be done, but surely the kind of broadstroke taken by the Leader of the Opposition is unfair, except his last statement relating to the Health Services Commission, which I assume means that he feels that the government ought to take over a greater responsibility in more direct policy making at the Health Services Commission level.

If that's the case, and I believe the member for St. Boniface, speaking on behalf of the Liberal Party, did say that was the case, that's very important, Mr. Speaker. Because we should know in our planning process what do all the elected representatives mean, and I interpret, rightly or wrongly, the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that he believes that. Now if he doesn't, the Member for Pembina who is getting ready to speak, and I think the member for Birtle-Russell, who looks as if he is getting ready to speak, and possibly -

CONCURRENCE

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd). . . .well, the member for Charleswood isn't here, so I can't ask him. I was going to say unfortunately --(Interjection)-- Sure I'd like to hear that because we're talking about delivery of Health Services, we're talking about delivery of welfare services, we're talking about the department which probably deals more with a vast majority of Manitobans than any other department.

So we ought to hear from them. We ought to know what they feel. Do they agree with their leader? And now I don't know whether it's good or bad that their leader has left them, whether they are more free now to speak their minds, whether they would be more constrained to speak in his presence, because, Mr. Speaker, I've said it before, and I'm not the only one; it's not as if I've just thought it, or just come to my own conclusions, every press, not report but commentator, every TV commentator, every radio commentator, every political commentator, always draws to the attention of the people who listen to them, that there is a vast difference discernible, not just by us on this side who are possibly looking for that difference, but discernible to all commentators a vast difference between the attitude of the leader of the opposition when it comes especially to matters such as the Department of Health and Social Development, and the majority of his caucus.

It's high time we found out Mr. Speaker, or it's high time the people of Manitoba found out. We in government should know, because we don't know to whom to give weight to opposition feelings on anything. Is it the Leader of the Opposition that seems to stand alone, or is it the member for Pembina, or is it the official spokesman for the party, or do the members of the Conservative caucus actually agree with the Leader of the Opposition on these issues on which he speaks?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I may have been unfair to him when I said earlier today that I believed that he spoke in generalities with a broad brush. Maybe I was unfair to him. Maybe he doesn't dare say just what he thinks in a specific way, because then maybe he would actually provoke his caucus backbench to stand up and say, "Wait a minute, Mr. Leader. It is true that we endorse our support of you. It is true that we appeared at the convention, yes, you are our leader, but you've gone just a little beyond that which we can stomach, because now you're starting to talk in a concrete way, in a different point of view than we have."

Mr. Speaker, it's time the people of Manitoba, and it would be helpful to those of us on our side, found out who indeed speaks on behalf of the Conservative party of Manitoba on issues such as welfare, on issues such as delivery of Health Services, on issues of that department. I would think that there are members opposite who would say, "Let that department be cut down to a very small department, let them pass on the CAP moneys that come from the Federal Government to provide a minimal support to the people of Manitoba. Let's make sure that the people of Manitoba, who are dependent on welfare, receive so little in amount that they must go out on the streets, working hard to make their living rather than be the handout people that were so described by both the Conservatives and the Liberals, and especially by the Liberals during the campaign with their drawing of the people asking for handouts. I know that the member for Fort Rouge had the courage to disassociate himself from that disgusting advertisement of the Liberal Party during the campaign, but other members of his party who are present in this apparently lacked that courage, or believed it. And I really don't think they believed it. I think they were sick at the stomach when they saw it, but didn't, didn't have the courage that the member for Fort Rouge had.

Well, come back to Conservatives. That advertisement - I remember the advertisements of the Conservatives, most of them do. I would imagine every one of them present at this moment agreed with them. I somehow feel that the Leader of the Opposition was embarrassed that when he came home to his constituency and looked at some of his supporters, he was red in the face --(Interjection)--by that. The member for Swan River now wants to make a contribution. I wish he'd go back in the Chair, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's a pleasure, you don't know the pleasure that some of us have when you leave, Mr. Speaker, and ask the Member for Swan River to sit in your place, because you know he is the most silent member of the House when he sits in your Chair. And that of course changes his attitude when he comes back.

Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the conclusion of this morning's session. I do want to refer to the statements made about interest rates of pension funds that were discussed with the Member of Fort Rouge. I would like to tell him that the investments by the various

CONCURRENCE

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd). . . . pension funds of course are made annually, and they are not made on short-term necessarily. They're made long-term, so that at no time can they reflect the existing market. Either they would be well above it or well below it, depending where the market has fluctuated to. But certainly as they make their investments they try to get the highest gain. I am informed that the over-all yield of the Workmen's Compensation Pension Fund or Board Fund, is seven percent; the Superannuation Fund has a fixed income return of 6.99 percent, but the over-all, and this is interesting, is 6.63 percent because they have been enabled to get into some equity stock situation so that now they have some equity stocks, which they hope will have a growth feature to them rather than a return feature, and frankly I don't think that they made such a good choice. --(Interjection)-- Well - but nevertheless that was --(Interjection)-- they did. These pension people, the ones that the Minister of Health referred to, wanted to get into that growth factor, and therefore influenced it. The Teachers Fund 6.6 percent over-all. I don't know what their fixed income is, but over-all. I find that 1972 life insurance companies were reporting 6.54 percent as their over-all return.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying, repeating what was said by the Minister of Health, each one of the funds I've referred to that are government - that come under government umbrella somehow, have purchased 10 percent of the - 10 percent returns. Now that's the latest purchase they made, was returns of 10 percent. And therefore one would have to say, should those pensioners be told that their pension is dependent on the interest rate that ought to be given for housing, even though it's substantially less than the general earnings of the province, I don't think you have a right to tell them that. And I don't believe that the Liberal Party would support that either, but I believe it was misinformed, as is often the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it's always amusing to listen to the remarks of the Minister of Finance. I don't know whether he is jealous of the Conservative Party that they can have the freedom of expression as expressed by our leader, or as expressed by the Member of Pembina, but really the Conservative Party is probably the party that identifies with the individual in society.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GRAHAM: We're the freest of any political party.....

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.