

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 8, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 21 students of Grade 11 standing of the Charleswood School. These students are under the direction of Mr. O. Hood and Mrs. C. T. G. Bailey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

We also have 75 students of Grade 9 standing of the Sisler High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lukie and Mr. Cumming. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

And we also have 33 students of Grade 9 standing of the General Wolfe School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Nixon. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

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; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Well, Mr. Speaker, really on a point of order, I wonder if the question period could be delayed and we'd recess for five minutes so the front bench could be filled so that we could ask questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I think that's hardly necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to address particular questions. There are three Ministers present and I'm not sure that they're the acting, acting, acting Ministers for the First Minister or for the Minister of Finance or others, and I wonder if realistically it can be delayed until they are in a position to be with us so that the questions could be directed to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I wholly agree with my — speaking to the same order — with my Leader. I have a question that I think is very important. The Minister is absent. Now the First Minister is in his chair — he moves in pretty quietly; he's a pretty sneaky fellow. I'm ready to go with the question if he's had time to look at the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member place his question.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, in that case I'll put the question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Why has the Racing Commission not answered recent allegations regarding the resignation of one Ralph Kennedy, who was on many newscasts and papers, the commission being a government-appointed body? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have the question here in written form. I believe that the Commission in question is one that is chaired by one Sidney Halter. I have not had any information brought to my attention to indicate that there is any abnormal reason for Mr. Kennedy's resignation. It would be a case of checking with the Chairman of the Commission and the Minister's Office to ascertain the particulars.

MR. MCGREGOR: A supplementary. Could the First Minister inform me when the responsible Minister might be in this House because I would like to carry this just a little bit further at that time?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation has had

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . meetings with the Ministers of Tourism and Recreation of other western provinces, in Edmonton. I believe at the present time and for tomorrow he is meeting with officials of Departments of Tourism in Ontario and in Ottawa.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health. Can he confirm that the Concordia Hospital is approximately 30 percent vacant, that it has surplus bed capacity of 30 percent at a time when most other hospitals have waiting lists for admission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that so I'll take the question as notice and inform the honourable member if he is not already informed. It seems that he has the statistics but I'll inform myself and find out the reasons why, if such a vacancy is correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, a supplementary?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. While the Minister of Health is taking that question as notice I wonder if he would also take as notice and report to the House what is the delay, what is the hold-up in the advance of funds, whether they're civic or municipal or provincial, to the Concordia Hospital in the construction of a new hospital?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is no undue waiting period experienced by the Concordia Board. Everything is proceeding as it should.

MR. ASPER: Is it not a fact — to the Minister of Health — that the City of Winnipeg is in fact withholding or delaying the advancement of approximately . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is out of order since it relates to another level of government. Does the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party wish to rephrase it?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Health. Would he then take as notice and report to the House the question: if Concordia has . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is supplementary--hypothetical in that context.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question presupposes the accuracy of the first question. I'm assuming and maybe I phrased it to make it sound hypothetical, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member place his question.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The question is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ASPER: Will he confirm . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In quick succession we have one question coming which asks about the intentions of another level of government, which is clearly out of order, and then on its heels comes another question which presupposes — to use my honourable friend's words — the accuracy of a preceding question, all of which, presupposition and hypotheses, was not within the rules of the question period.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party,

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Will he also take as notice the question that the per patient cost—is the per patient cost at Concordia 30 percent higher than the per patient cost in comparable hospitals owing to the lack of full utilization of the bed space there?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is asking two questions and I don't really know in what context that he is asking his last question, if it is in relation to the contemplated addition to Concordia or to the existing facilities. If the honourable member is asking if there is additional costs of 30 percent, approximately 30 percent on existing facilities because of vacancy, this I'd have to check out and find out; and secondly, I would like to inform the honourable member that there is no delay pertaining to the commitment of Unicity pertaining to the construction of Concordia because there was a commitment made by Metro which was honoured by Unicity and I have correspondence to justify that.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has figures that include the number of disruptions on the DC transmission system that have occurred in Manitoba in the past few months.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would obviously have to take that question as notice and check with the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro. I'll try to have that information for my honourable friend by the end of the week.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, well I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether it's not a fact that the root cause of the disruptions is a result of the recurrent failure of the mercury arc converter associated with the Kettle Generating Station?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding of it as a layman as well, but then again, Sir, the utilization of the mercury arc type of technology is one which at that high voltage, so I am told, is really pioneering the outer limits of technology relative to the use of mercury arc in direct current transmission. That is something which both English Electric and Manitoba Hydro and Atomic Energy, and all those that were involved right from the initial instance knew, that they were pioneering technology and really on the outer fringes of it at that.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate on whose authority the mercury arc converter was purchased and installed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check that and I should think for the most part — well it would be an engineering decision. I believe that involved negotiations between Hydro, Atomic Energy of Canada in the first place, and then talks with English Electric.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister could confirm the fact that the mercury arc converter was substituted for a solid state converter system, considered preferable by most experts, on the orders of David Cass-Beggs?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the reference to solid state, even though I am a layman in the matter and my honourable friend is obviously one too, that there are just as many experts, in fact I should think more, who would question reliance on solid state technology in this particular respect.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the First Minister can assure the people of Manitoba that no further breakdowns of this converter, perhaps of several weeks' duration, are expected.

MR. SCHREYER: Two points, Mr. Speaker. The first point is that in recent months I have not been advised that there is any undue problem with respect to the bringing into full transmission capacity of the DC line. I have not been advised if there are any abnormal problems being encountered.

Point No. 2 is that the guarantee that my honourable friend is asking for is of course impossible to give, and it would be just as impossible to give it with respect to any solid state technology used in a DC transmission system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further question to the First Minister. Is it correct that Hydro has drawn down Lake Winnipeg and the rest of the water system substantially for export power purposes, and that we are in fact in some danger of a power shortage in the next twelve months?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to reply unless I am absolutely sure I heard the question properly. But if I did hear it properly I can hardly believe my ears. Would my honourable friend please repeat it and I'd like to listen very carefully.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the question is whether or not Hydro has not drawn down Lake Winnipeg and the rest of the Nelson system, including the Lake of the Woods-Lake Winnipeg system, substantially for the purposes of export sale of power in the last twelve months and that we are in some danger of a power shortage in the next twelve months.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I blush for my honourable friend. Did he say has Manitoba Hydro drawn down Lake Winnipeg? Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I'll let my honourable friend, I will allow him to reflect on the idiocy of that question. There is nothing to be drawn down on Lake Winnipeg. There is no controlling structure. What is my honourable friend -- my honourable friend was not referring to the Winnipeg River. If he was let him say so. He was referring to Lake Winnipeg.

A MEMBER: Lake Winnipeg.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Well if he was referring to Lake Winnipeg, then obviously the question is really quite silly. If he is referring to the Winnipeg River that's another matter. But now let him be clear what he's referring to.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the question was whether or not Lake Winnipeg and the Lake Winnipeg system into the Nelson had been drawn down, and I asked specifically whether the Lake of the Woods and the Winnipeg River portion of it had been drawn down for the purpose, including Lake Winnipeg, which may be at a constant level but the water system running into it has been drawn down for the purpose of providing export power.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg River may be drawn down, I don't accept the validity of that assumption or implication, and for that matter so may the Saskatchewan River, but let it be very clear that Lake Winnipeg as such cannot be drawn down, not until such time as there is regulation. My honourable friend — I will do him the kindness of taking that question as notice and taking it up with the Hydro engineers. But on the very surface of it, any suggestion that Lake Winnipeg per se can be drawn down is patently absurd.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his kindness. The essence of the problem is whether or not the system . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. CRAIK: . . . is whether or not the system, including Cedar Lake, Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg River system and other entries into Lake Winnipeg, the entire system has been drawn down substantially for power for export purposes, and whether or not it is going to provide a potential problem in the next twelve months for a domestic power shortage in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's quite a different matter if my honourable friend is referring to the drawing down of forebays on the rivers tributary to Lake Winnipeg, which is quite apart from any suggestion that there is a drawing down of the lake itself. Be that as it may, I will take the question as notice and reply tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the First Minister in absence of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Does the government consider the importation of Father Berrigan to the University of Manitoba staff and the relevant American culture problems which he represents, do they consider it to be a relevant contribution to academic matters in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is — and I may well be wrong in this — that Father Berrigan was hired by the Faculty of Religious Studies at the University of Manitoba. I don't know who is the head of the Faculty of Religious Studies; maybe I should know but I tell you, Sir, I don't know who that person might be, but I assume that he is a man of some considerable judgment or he wouldn't be head of the Faculty of Religious Studies. I mean, that would seem to follow. And the second point I have is that I believe that Father Berrigan was tried in a U.S. court on some of the charges and obviously he must have been freed of those charges, otherwise he would be in jail. Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, well I'm trying to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that obviously Father Berrigan was in jail while he was on arraignment awaiting trial, but I believe that in the trial he was acquitted. --(Interjection)-- Well in either case, Sir, the government does not make decisions for the Faculty of Religious Studies at the University of Manitoba or any other faculty, including pharmacy, and engineering, and you name it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question was really whether the government considered the importation of an American cultural problem, you know, as represented by Father Berrigan was in fact the type of move that was in the interests of the education system in Manitoba. It wasn't a question of the details of why he's here or not here. I believe that he's on bail until August or something like that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. CRAIK: . . . and afterwards he's a free man, but that's not the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I say again that matters pertaining to hiring of staff by any faculty, including the Faculty of Religious Studies, is a matter to be decided by the Faculty of Religious Studies and by the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . On matters of immigration, that comes under the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration. The Province of Manitoba will not involve itself in matters that are not under its purview. There are other levels of government, each to exercise their responsibilities.

A MEMBER: Would you have it otherwise?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister as the Minister responsible for Hydro. I wonder if he could tell the House at this time when the Public Utilities Committee will again meet in order to continue the consideration of the Hydro Report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will have to await the return of the House Leader. There are a number of committees to schedule and I am not aware of the precise scheduling for each of these.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister, in view of his reply to a similar question on February 23rd, would consider arranging that meeting to be held when Mr. Cass-Beggs was available during his visit to Winnipeg May 12 to 15.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no basis for that request.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, by way of a question to the First Minister, in view of the disruptions that have occurred in Manitoba and may occur in the future, would it not be in the interest of the people of Manitoba to have Mr. Cass-Beggs come before the Committee?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Bateman, has advised me in the past on difficulties encountered by Hydro systems, including the problem of DC transmission, involving in turn the utilization of mercury arc technology. Mr. Bateman is quite capable of dealing with those matters. I say again, and I will check, what is my understanding, that the DC transmission system is undergoing proving out, and no undue problems in recent weeks have been encountered.

MR. SPIVAK: To the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to comment to the House on the Provincial Government's position on Ottawa's proposal to abandon certain tax sources in return for assumption by the province of complete financial responsibility for health programming.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I received a written summary, and it's only a summary, for the first time on this proposal approximately three hours ago, and I certainly have no intention of conveying an attitude on something that has been so recently received. It will require care and consideration.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would undertake to inform the House as soon as he is in a position to do so, and I would assume that would be within 24 hours or 48 hours, as to whether Manitoba will gain or lose by this proposal.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I--you know, Mr. Speaker, I would apologize just a little bit for taking 24 hours to give an answer on something as complicated as this. I think my honourable friend will have to be just patient enough to wait until Friday and maybe even next Monday.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the First Minister can undertake that we'll at least be informed in the House rather than by newspaper on this matter. And I wonder if as well, Mr. Speaker, he can indicate at the time that the information will be furnished to the House whether the proposals will involve or affect any other type of equalization payment to be made to Manitoba in the future.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the points that will have to be carefully explored, whether the federal proposal -- which is for the transfer of certain tax fields -- whether this is with or without equalization or partial equalization, and if so to what level, the highest province yield or the average of the two highest, or the national average, etc. In any case, this much is clear: it is a deviation from the proposal that was put forward at the January conference of First Ministers, at which most of the--I believe all of the provinces came to some agreement. So until Friday or Monday next, it will just not be possible to give any sort of position, indication of position.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the Minister caused any investigation to be made on the Fort Alexander Reserve at Pine Falls as a result of reports of five cases of hepatitis, gastro-intestinal and arthritic type of ailments, that were reported between December and March 13th and supposedly due to contaminated water supply, sewer backups and damp and cold buildings?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this question falls between two responsible departments of government, the Clean Environment Commission and my Department . . .

MR. SCHREYER: And the Government of Canada.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . and necessarily, like my Premier indicates, the Government of Canada because we are dealing with Treaty Indians and with waterways that fall in both responsibilities. As far as my jurisdiction is concerned in the Department of Health and Social Development, I'll take the question as notice, and the question pertaining to the Clean Environment Commission could be asked of the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the policy made by the Minister of Agriculture re the employment of students throughout the province, and I'm referring now to painters who are employed throughout the province, will they be able to apply for welfare assistance in view of the much labour or work they are not going to have because of the student employment this summer?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question in a sense is hypothetical. It's asking for a projection. It's out of order. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Is it the intention to call the Agricultural Committee some time during the Session yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may in my capacity as Acting House Leader, inform the honourable member that I will convey to the Honourable the House Leader on his return the request, as I would take this a request of my honourable friend from Rhineland, as to the calling of the Committee on Agriculture, and this would also deal with the calling of other committees as well.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Mines responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Has the Government of Manitoba made a loan to Advance Lighting Limited through MDC of approximately \$100,000 to \$140,000, and has that loan fallen into default, and is the government putting the company into receivership?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that should be an order for return.

MR. ASPER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There's no point of order.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Not on the answer.

MR. ASPER: Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I must indicate to the honourable member that an answer is an answer. You cannot raise a point of order on it. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. The question then is: is Advance Lighting Limited in default in its loan from the Manitoba Development Corporation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. I would have no way of knowing; it has not been brought to my attention. I would suggest to my honourable friend for specifics of that kind he should file an order for return.

MR. ASPER: Has the Government of Manitoba — to the First Minister — filed a suit for receivership against Advance Lighting?

MR. SCHREYER: Perhaps and then again perhaps not. I would suggest an order for return.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Arthur,

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Highways, I direct my question to the First Minister. I'd like to ask the First Minister if it is the intention of the Government to take heed to the request by resolution of the municipalities throughout the Province of Manitoba, to stop the downgrading of provincial roads throughout this province. --(Interjection)-- Downgrading of PR roads, Provincial roads,

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of meetings with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities over the course of the past few years, and meetings more than just annual meetings and with municipal officials. The question of the condition of provincial roads is one that seems to arise in some parts of the province more than others, and perhaps even that varies from year to year. The matter has been under consideration by the Minister of Highways over a period of a few years now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agri . . . Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Arthur have a supplementary question?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. I don't think I got a direct answer from the Minister. The Minister is aware of the resolution that was presented to Cabinet by the municipalities throughout the province, who are concerned about the downgrading of the provincial roads during the past four years, and I'm asking the Minister, the First Minister, if it is their intention to now start to upgrade the provincial roads to the condition that they were in back in '69 at least.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course we've had communications from municipal officials from time to time about various provincial roads, and we acknowledge that some provincial roads in some years, depending on the kind of spring there is, are in a condition which is not as good as we would like to see. On the other hand, I can tell my honourable friend that some provincial roads are perhaps in worse shape and others are in better shape than they've been before, and so the matter cannot be generalized about in the way in which he is attempting to do.

MR. WATT: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the First Minister not take it as an indication that a resolution passed by the Union of Municipalities that the roads were being abandoned or being downgraded is not the general opinion of the municipalities throughout the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I apologize that I was a little late. I just got in and I didn't hear the first part of the question but I got the last part of the question, and I want to inform my honourable friend the Member for Arthur that the Union of Rural Municipalities is more satisfied now with the condition of the roads and PR's in the Province of Manitoba than they've ever been before.

MR. WATT: May I direct a question now to the Minister of Highways? Could the Minister of Highways now give the House the information that he has from the municipalities throughout the Province of Manitoba, that indicates in writing that they are more satisfied now with the provincial roads than they ever were before?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what information the honourable member is asking for, but this has been told to me, I have met with the rural municipalities on many occasions, and they are satisfied. If the honourable member doesn't want to believe me it's up to him, but I've given that indication.

MR. WATT: To the Minister of Highways. If they are satisfied then, I ask the Honourable Minister why did they present that resolution and why did they pass it unanimously at the convention last fall, a resolution indicating that the PR roads were being downgraded by this government?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps that could be the case, I don't know; I'm not sure if it was passed or not; but if that were the case I can assure you that I don't know just what years you're talking about, but I can assure the honourable member that in the last couple of years or so that has not been the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member has had six questions on this same subject. If he wishes a new subject yes, otherwise I shall give the floor to some other member. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, then I guess a brand new question . . . I ask the Minister of Highways now, did the Executive of the Union of Municipalities present a resolution to the Cabinet as of last fall regarding . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. That question has already been framed three times. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce relating to the Federal-Provincial Conference on Transportation Policy on June 7th that's proposed for Brandon. Will the Minister agree to table in the House the position paper that Manitoba intends to present at that conference so that we may discuss it in his committee's hearings?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that that request is in accordance with traditional practice and procedure. Out of courtesy to the Honourable Mr. Marchand, the federal Minister of Transportation, I believe that that document is a document that he should present to him for his discussion. Subsequent to that meeting, subsequent to any decisions that may arise from that, there may be public announcements and statements made to this House, but it's entirely out of order, Mr. Chairman, to do what the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is suggesting.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister then indicate in lieu of tabling the statement, will he indicate to the House what specific changes he proposes to seek in the National Transportation Act?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there are a long list of specific changes that we are proposing to seek, not only in the National Transportation Act but also with regards to railway freight structures, but, Mr. Speaker, the question period is not the time to discuss this at any length. But I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that we have unanimity among the four western provinces in our concern with the injustice of railway freight rates and how they are holding back industrialization in western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Province of Manitoba and its Government encouraging an increased production of wheat in Manitoba such as is requested by the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone in Manitoba knows that there are expanded opportunities in the area of marketing of all grains that could be produced in this province, so that we are really not in a position to give preference to any one particular commodity. The farm community as a whole, Mr. Speaker, knows all of the marketing positions with respect to all grain commodities.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

A MEMBER: Orders for Return.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: There's one by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie which he asked to stand. I made a comment on it yesterday. I don't know whether he wants me to comment again, but in my opinion I think the question has to be, which is what an order for return is, has to be reworded. It's not in order the way it is at the present time. If the honourable member wishes, he can have a meeting with myself and we can discuss it. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree to your suggestion but if it would please Your Honour I would strike out the first paragraph and put the order now.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable to the House? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think really it involves more than that in some of the questions, and I do in respect to my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie, I would suggest to him that he accept your kind offer and go over the complete Order for Return. As to possible redrafting simply by deletion at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my honourable friend does not really give us an opportunity of further consideration, particularly, Mr. Speaker, in view of the offer that you made yesterday, I believe



## ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . it was, and now repeat today, and I would enjoin my honourable friend to accept that so that we could have a reprint of the request on the Orders of the Day.

POINT OF ORDER

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak on the point of order, and I raise a point of order at this time. Inherent in the Minister of Labour's suggestion is that there are certain questions of an Order which has not been put, which are not acceptable to the government. Well, I say inherent in his suggestion, and if I may continue on my point of order, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a precedent which in my opinion should not even be discussed. If for any member of the Opposition or any member of the House to put a series of questions by way of Order for Return, and if the Order should be out of order on a technical ground, well then that would come under the authority of the Speaker, and it would not -- and I repeat again-- it would not come under the authority of a member of the front bench to even suggest, before the Order is put, that there are certain questions that are unacceptable to the government side. So, Mr. Speaker, in order to resolve the matter, if you wish that I hold the Order I shall do, but I make the suggestion again, that I'm going to put the Order in its entirety in the way it's written excepting for the first paragraph, and I await your judgment.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the comments made by both members. I must indicate to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, Beauchesne Citation 172 indicates that the Speaker really is in control of the questions the way they are asked, the guidelines in respect to them. In my opinion, I was hoping the honourable member would redraft his Order for Return; since he only wishes to delete the first paragraph I find it unacceptable; if he wishes, I'll discuss it with him in my private chambers, but under the present condition it's not acceptable. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on your ruling. It's with deep regret that I challenge your ruling that this Order is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that there may be a methodology in handling this. I hope the honourable member will withdraw, at least temporarily, the question of the withdrawal of the ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think it was a firm ruling. You can indicate that. But I would like, if I may have the agreement of the House at this particular time, to make a brief explanation. I was not questioning the contents of the Order for Return as indicated by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, I am prepared . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . on a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage state his . . . Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's a point of order on a point of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . and I challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us get the question in context. I indicated yesterday that I wanted to have a consultation with the honourable member. He declined. Today I indicated the same proposition to him. Now according to our procedures, the Chair cannot start to get into a debate as to why a ruling has to be made. I've offered two invitations to the honourable member to discuss this particular Order for Return with me; he rejects. All he has done is offer to delete one particular section. That is not the problem with the Order for Return as it stands. Now all I can suggest to him is that if he has no desire to communicate, then I have no alternative but to offer to him that the question in its present form is unacceptable, and I'm citing Beauchesne's Citation 172. Now if he will have a look at it he'll notice that I am indicating why. Now the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie intends or suggests that we should proceed with this Order with the deletion of the preamble to the questions, then it will be acceptable to us; we have nothing to hide.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that may be the desire of the Minister of Labour, but according to our rules if the question is not placed in its proper context, if it's offensive, if it's ironic, if there are other deficiencies, Beauchesne Citation 172 indicates the Speaker should not

## POINT OF ORDER

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . accept it, and these are the things I wanted to discuss with the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie. Now, therefore, I'm indicating that I still think the question is not proper in the way it's been written. Now it may be acceptable to the whole House, and if the House wishes that, fine and dandy, but let me assure you that this is setting a precedent which I think is wrong.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may briefly--if it is with the agreement of the whole House that with the request that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the preamble to his questions be deleted, it becomes acceptable, then I suggest that we should--my honourable colleague the Minister of Agriculture says, "providing it doesn't establish a precedent." We have had in the past, Mr. Chairman, on a few occasions to my knowledge, a request from a member to make an amendment or a deletion in an Order for Return and this has been done in the past; we are not establishing a precedent in this particular case in my opinion. So I would suggest if we have the consent of the members of the House for the deletion, because after all we do have to have notices of the business of the House prior to discussing them in the House, that if the members of the Assembly are prepared to accept the request of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie for the deletion and then we proceed with the Order for Return, the government has nothing to hide and I suggest we should proceed on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intent and wish of the House to allow the questions to be amended by deleting the first paragraph? We must have unanimous consent. Agreed? Would the honourable member kindly stand up and say what he has to say so I can hear him too. The question is amended, is it acceptable to the House? Agreed? So ordered.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. What is the policy regarding the use of government aircraft in Manitoba for such things as NDP nominating conventions?
2. Are government back bench members permitted to "catch rides" on government aircraft?
3. When back bench government MLAs are given rides, are they billed for travel and at what rate?
4. What is the policy respecting travel by wives and other relatives with Cabinet Ministers on government aircraft?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister will allow, I will complete the Order, and I would love to have them suggest that this question should be debated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . finish my speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Would the honourable member proceed.

MR. G. JOHNSTON:

5. When wives or relatives accompany Cabinet Ministers, are they charged for such travel and at what rate?
6. Is the policy governing use of aircraft in these and other circumstances clearly defined and is it set down in writing or merely a verbal understanding?
7. What is the precise procedure for a Cabinet Minister to request the use of a government aircraft and through whom is this cleared?
8. Can the government provide a list of flights during the last 12-month period in which Cabinet Ministers were accompanied by wives or relatives and detailing the purpose of all such trips, together with the names of all such persons carried on these flights?
9. In any instances where wives or relatives were billed for such flights, can the government provide a list of the billings?
10. In all cases where there were no billings for wives or relatives, can the government provide an explanation of the reason in each case why there was no charge made?
11. Can the government provide a list of all flights during the last 12-month period on which government back bench MLAs were carried, indicating the date, purpose and destination in each case?
12. Can the government provide a list of the instances in which government back bench

## ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd), . . . MLAs were charged for flights aboard government aircraft together with the billings in each case?

13. Can the government provide a list of flights by government back bench MLAs for which no charge was made, together with an explanation in each case?

14. Would the government indicate whether its policy respecting the use of government aircraft applies only to NDP members of the Legislature or whether there is provision for opposition members to make use of such aircraft on official business?

15. Can the government provide a list of any flights during the last 12-month period which opposition members were carried on government aircraft?

16. Can the government provide a list of any flights by opposition members for which a charge was made, together with the billing in each case?

17. Can the government provide a list of any flights by opposition members for which no charge was made, together with an explanation in each case as to why no billing was made?

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, much of this information is contained in stuff that was tabled already earlier in the session, but we will be quite willing to provide the information asked for notwithstanding the strange wording of some of the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered. The Honourable House Leader, The Honourable First Minister,

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55(a)(1). The Honourable Member for Arthur.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I wish to, if I could get the attention of the Minister for a moment --(Interjection)-- I wish to retract a statement that I made last Friday morning in which I had stated that the Reston Hospital Board had a written notification stating that their term of administration would terminate on a given date. Over the weekend I found that I was wrong, that they did not have a written statement from the Commission. At that time I said that Mr. Hans Schneider had ignored the statement that they had it in a brief case. I found out over the weekend that while we did not have a written statement, that at two meetings, one held -- of the administrative bodies of the Elkhorn Hospital and the Reston Hospital, that Mr. Clare Bell had made statements at duly called meetings of the official boards of those two hospitals that, as of July 1st of 1973, their term of administration would be terminated.

SUPPLY - HEALTH Cont'd

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, last night the Minister of Health and Social Development answered a number of the questions that had been put to him by members on this side of the House with respect to the policies and programs for which his spending estimates are being passed at this time, and we appreciate the undertakings that he gave us with respect to some of those questions. Nonetheless there remained a number of questions that we believe are legitimate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The honourable member is speaking and it is very difficult for the Chair to hear what the honourable member is saying.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . that we believe are legitimate and that are equally deserving of the attention of the Minister, and certainly from our point of view require an answer. We don't disagree with our colleague, the Honourable Member for Virден, to whom reference was made last night by the Minister, to the effect that generally speaking the Minister is a

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . relatively easy gentleman to talk to. No one has ever suggested from a political point of view that that is not the case. Well, my colleague is asking the question now as to whether I'm speaking about him or not.

The Minister did make reference to the Member for Virden last night and the impression that I got from what he said was that the Minister is available for members on this side of the House, members in the Chamber generally, for consultations and conference, and I would say that I go along with that from the point of view of a serving member in this House. What we're concerned about is the attitude of the medical profession and the medical fraternity and allied fraternities in the health care field, and it's those people who have raised, those Manitobans who have raised the complaint that if the Minister is available for consultation he has not, and his governmental colleagues have not been available for meaningful consultations.

So I just want to emphasize the point that nothing that we have said up to now has been intended to cast the Minister in the role of a government officer with whom we cannot make contact, but that's hardly the requirement on his part that the people of Manitoba need and deserve, and that's hardly important. The important thing is that those people who serve medicine and health care in this province have a chance to meet with him in a meaningful way without being elected to this Chamber, and that has been the nub and the essence of our complaint where communication is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what the Minister has to say on the subject and the statistics with which he is armed, and he has presented many interesting statistics in this Chamber with which I'd like to have closer contact and closer study. The fact of the matter is that doctors are leaving Manitoba in the opinion of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Manitoba Medical Association, if in no other form at least by failing to come back after they've taken post-graduate courses elsewhere. The Minister has made many references to the ratio of doctors to patients, doctors to citizens in Manitoba in 1973, 1972, as compared to the mid-1960's or the early 1960's and as compared to other provinces in Canada and other parts of the world. He has made frequent references to a ratio which he says now from his seat looks pretty good, and in one context it does look pretty good, but the question remains, what kind of doctors is he talking about? Is he talking about general practitioners? Is he talking about specialists? Is he talking about--(Interjection)--Yes. Is he talking about specific practicing specialists in the various operative fields of medicine, or is he talking about laboratory technicians? Is he talking about academic medical men, teachers, students, post-graduate students? The basic question of importance to the people of Manitoba is that the doctors who are here are doctors who are practicing specialists and G.P.'s.

Mr. Chairman, the figures that I have in front of me — and I make no bones about saying they were given to me by doctors and by members of the Manitoba Medical Association — indicate that there has been a steady decline, a steady decline, Sir, in the total percentage of Manitoba-trained doctors practicing in Manitoba in the last ten years. And if I hadn't been armed with figures of that sort I wouldn't have made the charges in the House that I made last Friday when I said that we are suffering from an outflow, we are suffering from an exodus of Manitoba-trained doctors in comparison to doctors trained in other parts of the world. There has been, there has been this steady decrease, as I say, and alongside it there has been a corresponding increase in the number of foreign-trained doctors or doctors that are classified as having been trained other than in the rest of Canada or the U.K. That is, the tables are based on the following categories: Manitoba-trained, Canada-trained, U.K.-trained and Others covering those in all other parts of the world. And the statistics with which I have been made familiar by members of the Manitoba Medical Association and by individual doctors speaking individually and not specifically for the Manitoba Medical Association, reflect that between the period 1964 and 1972 there has been, as I have said, a steady decline in the total percentage of Manitoba-trained doctors remaining to practice here, and a corresponding increase in the number of foreign-trained, and that almost half of that decline has occurred in the last two years. And the figures with which I buttress my argument on this point, Mr. Chairman, are these:

In 1964 the percentage of Manitoba-trained doctors practicing in Manitoba represented 60.3 percent of the total. The number of doctors trained in other parts of Canada practicing in Manitoba represented 11.6 percent. U.K.-trained was 18.4 percent. Others were 9.7 percent. So, to recap, in 1964 we were looking at a figure of 60.3 percent for Manitoba, a figure of 9.7 percent for Other.

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . .

In 1966 the Manitoba percentage had slipped to 57.4; the category described as Other had risen to 11.2.

In 1968 the Manitoba percentage had slipped to 56.4 and the Others had risen to 12.9.

In 1970 the Manitoba percentage had slipped to 54.4 and the Others had risen to 14.6.

And in 1972, last year, the Manitoba percentage stood at 50.3 percent and the Others totalled 18.2 percent, and the over-all breakdown of the 1972 figure was Manitoba-trained 50.3 percent; Canada-trained other than Manitoba 10.7 percent; U.K.-trained 20.8 percent, and Others, from all other parts of the world, 18.2 percent.

Now that, in terms of percentages at least, Mr. Chairman, represents the kind of steady decline which I have confronted the Minister with in repeated arguments on this point, steady decline in terms of Manitoba-trained doctors practicing here and a corresponding increase in the number of foreign-trained doctors practicing here, and as I said a moment ago, the tables show that almost half of that decline has occurred in the last two years between 1970 and the end of 1972. So I'm interested in the Minister's figures, the Minister's statistics. I'm prepared to be proven wrong if I'm wrong on this point. What we're trying to arrive at here is the truth of the matter. I simply, I simply respond to the statistics that he read into the House a few days ago with the statistics that have been made familiar to me, the statistics that I've been acquainted with, and it's this kind of, it's this kind of statistical evidence that alarms many of us and that justifies the argument that we have made to the effect that we stand in danger here in Manitoba of losing a greater and greater percentage of our Manitoba-trained doctors.

And I go back to the point that I made a few minutes ago, that in many aspects of this question the answer can be found in the fact that many doctors going on post-graduate courses and on locum tenens and other particular individual assignments of a temporary nature are not returning to the Province of Manitoba after leaving to take those other postings or those other courses. And it adds up to the point that I have tried to bring to the Minister's attention, that we're losing Manitoba-trained doctors. By what means is really--or by what method or by what avenue is really secondary. It's certainly not irrelevant but it's really secondary. The figures, the percentages are down.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three other questions that I would ask of the Minister at this time on this specific item in his Estimates. There are a number of other specifics that perhaps should wait for other individual resolutions on his Estimates, but there are one or two questions that I would like to address to him at this phase of the study of his Estimates.

I would like to bring to his attention the sense of irritation that exists among the medical fraternity with respect -- (Interjection) -- well, with respect to the kind of petty annoyances that this government, through the MHSC and through its Department of Health and Social Development, puts in the doctors' way in Manitoba. I would like to ask him whether it's necessary, for example, that the kind of review practice, deterrent practice that is undertaken by the MHSC to make sure that doctors are not stealing in the bills that they're submitting, need to be carried on at either such a high figure or need to be emphasized so blatantly. Mr. Chairman, there is approximately 350,000 medical claims a month that go through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The government, according to my information, circularizes about ten percent of these, in other words checks on about ten percent of these to satisfy themselves that the doctors, in its view, are not stealing. The circular asks, for example, if there's anything wrong with your doctor's statement or not as to the services he performed for you, and if there is would you let us know? Well, I think the deterrent aspect is good by ten percent seems a suspiciously high percentage, a suspiciously and unnecessarily high figure, which once again manifests and reflects this government's attitude of mistrust and suspicion of the medical fraternity and the medical profession. What it says in effect is, as we've been telling you, "We, this Government, don't trust you, the doctors." Why wouldn't one percent be just as good a deterrent? Why does it have to be as high as ten percent? And how much did the government save last year through this check, if in fact it saved anything? How many fraudulent claims, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, that is fraudulent claims by doctors, has this system turned up? Because in the answer to that question lies the answer as to whether, quite apart from the moral aspect of the thing, whether mathematically and economically this kind of practice is justified.

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . .

The drug substitution program includes another form of petty annoyance for the doctors and for the medical profession. It's just another encumbrance and road block in the way of the doctors' freedom and flexibility and another indicator that the government does not trust the doctors to practice the profession of medicine by themselves. These are things on which I would like the Minister's opinion, Mr. Chairman. The costs are of course important. The policing costs are important, but more important, really, is the effect and the impact that that kind of an attitude has on medicine and on the medical profession generally--and on the whole relationship to which I've made considerable reference in the past, between government, doctor and citizen.

Mr. Chairman, we read in the last two or three days now of serious major bargaining sessions between the Manitoba Medical Association and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and through it the government, which would seem once again to underscore the other point that we have made in the past, to wit that there have been no really serious negotiating sessions, from the government's point of view at any rate, in the past. And I would ask the Minister, who is going to be on the team or who is on the team and who may be added to the team of government negotiators now going into what are reported to be firm negotiations with the MMA on a new fee schedule and on other health care topics? And how much of the field of health care and the policies and programs in the field of health care are involved in the negotiations under-way? Are the negotiators from the two sides talking specifically, purely and merely about fee schedules, or are they talking about other forms, alternative forms of payment, alternative forms of service, alternative forms of relationship between the medical fraternity and the government, indeed even about the collective bargaining position of the doctors themselves and the advisability of the medical practitioners forming themselves into a union. What kind of reading, what kind of reaction does the government and does the MHSC have to the indications that the doctors may form a union? What kind of a reaction does the government have to the things that the MMA are going to be looking for in the negotiations now under-way?

I would ask the Minister whether a firm schedule of meetings has been set up, Mr. Chairman, or whether there is an initial meeting this week and then whether the next stages of the bargaining session are left to the discretion of the government. I would ask whether the government or the MHSC, either one, will be making regular progress reports on these negotiations so that Manitobans know just what kind of problems exist in reality between their doctors and their government and what kind of conscientious effort is being made on both sides to resolve those problems and questions.

I would also like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether the government is of the opinion that the negotiations now under-way are designed to produce a binding collective agreement between the two sides. Is this a phrase simply used by newspaper reporters covering the MMA's position? Is it a phrase simply used by the MMA itself, or is the government of the opinion that the negotiations now firm, now apparently proceeding as of 3:00 o'clock yesterday afternoon, should be calculated, should be designed to produce a binding collective agreement that would cover all government dealings with the professional medical body? Does the decision that the Medical Association took last weekend go beyond the MHSC's ambition and the government's ambition in this field at the present time? That is, Mr. Chairman, the Medical Association has elected to send its representatives to negotiate with the Provincial Government on fees, and to seek a binding collective agreement to cover all government dealings with their professional body. How does that compare with the ambitions of the government and the MHSC themselves? Are they concerned primarily at this point with fee schedule or do they want something that will cover the total spectrum of dealings between government and the medical profession?

These are questions that I would like to refer to the Minister at the present time, Mr. Chairman. I would also just remind him and myself that there are other aspects of his health program that do deserve some questions. One of them is the current position of the Children's Hospital, now included in the major central medical complex. This was a subject that we examined last year at the time of the centralization of the major medical institutions downtown, and I'm interested again this year in some professional opinion as to the effect this has had in the past year and appears to be perhaps promising for the future on the successful operation

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . of the Childrens Hospital itself, but that can be examined possibly at a stage later on in the Estimates unless the Minister wants to make a note to himself on that point at this stage. It is something that I think many of us are concerned about.

The hospital in question, for example, was built on the kind of conscientious, responsible, volunteer commitment that many people in the community could bring to it in an autonomous kind of a way while it enjoyed prominent autonomy of its own. Now that it's merged in the Health Sciences Centre, one very serious question must be repeatedly posed. Has there been damage to the Childrens Hospital as a result? As a matter of fact, it probably was the freeze on debate of a year or a year and a half ago imposed by the government, largely through the Minister responsible for Universities, that is likely to blame for any damage to the Childrens Hospital that has resulted as a consequence of the new institutional setup. Had the subject been freed for open examination and debate a year or a year and a half ago, before the Health Sciences Centre became a reality, the pitfalls and perils of absorbing the Childrens Hospital into that huge complex could have been scrutinized properly, but there was a freeze imposed on debate, as all members will recall, in the field of health and with respect to capital construction in the field of health, policies in the field of health, programs being experimented with by the government, and there was no opportunity to sound out the viability and the rationale for absorbing the Childrens Hospital into the Health Sciences Centre complex. It just drifted in because that was what was happening under government influence in the pressure of the verbal vacuum, that was existing at that time, and now is the time I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the position of the Childrens Hospital and all connected with it should be re-examined.

Now is the time to ask ourselves whether the care of children in Manitoba is as good as it used to be or whether it's been endangered by subordinating that hospital to the interests of the Health Sciences Centre. In that respect I think we could get some answers from persons like Dr. Harry Medovy and other renowned and experienced pediatricians. I wonder whether the government has consulted with doctors of that type to get opinions and to get answers on the basis of their record thus far with the Manitoba Medical Association. I'd be willing to bet that they haven't consulted with doctors on subjects of that kind, they haven't sought the opinion of those who are in the profession and in the field. They've made up their minds in their own ivory towers and that's good enough for them, and by definition in their terms therefore, good enough for Manitobans.

Well, perhaps silence on that subject hasn't hurt in this case, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps it has hurt, and I would ask the Minister now to break the freeze on discussion of that subject along with his addressing himself to some of the other questions that I have asked him in the last few minutes and that still remain, having been posed by some of my colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions for the Minister that arise out of his original presentations, and I'm thinking particularly of his remarks in respect to the White Paper on Health Services and the statements which he made in respect to what he describes as a regional integrated delivery of services by his department.

I also have in front of me, Mr. Chairman, a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune of November 11th in which the Minister is quoted as describing a new health plan which is being tested in the Brandon area. I take from this, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has now completed about six months on that project in the Brandon area, and that on the basis and evaluation of that project he is prepared to continue and to institute in many or most of the regions in Manitoba this integrated services delivery plan on July 1st. Mr. Speaker, at this stage there are a few questions which I think should be answered by the Minister. My colleague the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has referred to a number of times about the vagueness of the relationship between the medical profession and the department in respect to these integrated services, but even in respect to the boundaries of the regions, Mr. Chairman, it appears that there has been no clear definition, and if we are in fact to embark upon a regional plan on July 1, it would seem to me that at least the boundaries should have been defined and perhaps legislated for at this stage. There are still health units presently operating and I presume that in order to switch from those units to a regional concept it would be necessary to dissolve the present health units.

The minister has also spoken about regional boards and the question now to be asked is, have these boards been constituted? Have there been any directions officially from the

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. MCGILL cont'd). . . . department to existing boards, hospital boards and other advisory boards in respect to services generally from his department?

Mr. Chairman, one of the immediate problems, it seems to me, is for the department to define clearly the role of VON in nursing home care. If on July 1 the new service is to be complete and functioning, why has the department not clearly established what the role of the Victorian Order of Nurses will be in respect to nursing home care? It seems to me that **this** organization has been one of the major suppliers of this vital service in the past. I'm told they do not understand what their function will be. I'm told that they are not now aware and there is a complete vagueness in respect to the function which they will continue to play, if any, in the new integrated services. If the department is in fact intending to continue with the Victorian Order of Nurses and their service to nursing care in the homes, is it planned to have social assistance provide some funds for the patients to enable them to pay the fee structure of the VON, or is it intended that VON become part of the public health nursing facility?

Another obvious question to be asked is: since the public health nursing services are usually on a five-day-a-week basis, what happens to the other two days of the week? I'm told that VON has always provided home care on a seven-day-a-week basis. Is it the intention of the department to permit VON to serve on the two days of the week when public nursing is not available, or is there some—I'm sure the department has definite plans but I wonder why there is no clear definition at this stage.

Previously, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister what his plans were for the dispensing of drugs within the regions, particularly as they would be supplied to nursing home beds which will be under the jurisdiction, I assume, of his department on July 1. I think the present suppliers have a right to know what these plans may be. Undoubtedly it will have a great effect on the staffing, the amount of service which the retail outlets that are now involved are having to provide. Surely since we are six weeks from the beginning of the new plan, surely it's time for the Minister to state clearly and publicly what happens to the present suppliers, what are his plans for the future.

Well, Mr. Chairman, may I now go to a discussion of the plans of the department for the replacement of the Brandon Correctional Institute. The Minister did indicate previously that it is intended that the construction of this new facility will begin some time this fall. I'm wondering if there has been any public involvement in the planning of the new and enlarged facility which the Minister indicates will involve some additional regionalized services which are not presently able to be handled with the scope of the current Brandon correctional facility.

Has the department seen fit to communicate or to consult with such organizations, interested organizations such as the John Howard Society, the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, the Manitoba Metis Federation. I suggest that it would be interesting to know whether in the planning of the new facility and in the enlarged function, whether there has been any public involvement in this matter.

I would like to also inquire of the Minister what modifications are now ongoing in the Brandon Correctional Institute, if this involves some change of function of whether or not it's to be retained when a new facility is built; whether it's intended to be a juvenile holding facility or whether these are merely temporary modifications that have to do with its present function.

I know that the department has been aware of and been informed of the feelings of the Manitoba Medical Association District Number 3 in respect to the great need for some kind of halfway house or drying out facilities for alcohol problems and drug problems in the area. In the discussion yesterday of the appropriations under the Capital Supply Bill it was indicated that there were appropriations for alcoholism and drug care in Brandon, Thompson and The Pas. Perhaps the Minister could indicate whether this is an extension to acute care beds or whether it is in the nature of some kind of halfway facility that would assist people with this problem and perhaps relieve some of the pressure on correctional institutions where people requiring this service are now being held in lieu of or for lack of more appropriate types of facilities.

For some time there has been a camp in the Spruce Woods that has been concerned, I'm told, primarily with alcohol treatment, treatment of alcoholics, and the rehabilitation of those alcoholics. Is there any change contemplated in the function of that camp? Is this camp being



## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. MCGILL cont'd). . . . phased out at the present time or is it the intention of the department to use it for some different kind of treatment centre? I understand that this has been in use for a number of years and at the present time is somewhat reduced in its staffing and in its number of patients.

If I may just revert briefly to the problems of the administration of nursing care homes in the Brandon area. Under the integrated plan, has there been any clear statement of the policy of the department in respect to these nursing care homes publicly announced as yet? There has been a term used which needs some definition, that of "preferred beds." I understand that some nursing care homes have been approached to see what establishment they will be permitted in respect to preferred beds. I haven't heard this term used publicly and perhaps the Minister would be prepared to give us some definition of the term and the meaning of the statement.

Mr. Chairman, I think this really covers the major items that I have to bring to the Minister's attention at this time. The question of the treatment of alcoholics and its separation from correctional institutions is a major one in our area, and it may be that the department has already provided in the Capital Estimates for something of this nature but, if this is so, certainly we would like to hear of the Minister's plans.

We have also a very real concern for the future of the Victorian Order of Nurses' program of bringing nursing care home to the patients in their own homes. I would like the Minister to make a public statement as to his plans for integrating the service into the regional integrated programs that he has in mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to some of the questions that were posed of me, first of all, in regards to the Honourable Member for Arthur. He was making reference to a verbal comment made by one of my civil servants, namely Mr. Clare Bell of the Health Services Commission, in regards to the Reston Hospital Board and its termination of responsibility. I wasn't aware of this verbal comment and I will be checking with the Manitoba Health Services Commission. There were no directives on my part to terminate the responsibility of the Reston Hospital Board as of the 1st of July. There may be a conflict in statements in the sense that, as the honourable members of the House are quite aware, on the 1st of July is the start-up date for the coverage of all levels of care in the Province of Manitoba, and it could have been a statement made by Mr. Clare Bell of the Health Services Commission in regards to that date as being a start-up for a co-ordinated effort on the part of many boards in Reston and surrounding areas.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry, who is not in his seat, again showed a lot of concern in regard to the medical profession, and I must tell the honourable member through you, Mr. Chairman, that at no time have I refused to answer calls by any members of the medical profession or anyone, as far as that goes, in the Province of Manitoba that has called my office. I've never refused to meet any member of the medical profession. I'm even open to house calls to the medical profession. I've been refused a house call myself, but I've always been open to house calls personally, especially to the medical profession. --(Interjection)--No, I don't. It's all part of my 15 thousand six--(Interjection)--It's not on the fee for service, it's all part of the salary that I'm paid as a Minister of the Crown.

The honourable member made reference to the Medical Review Committee. I must inform the honourable member in case he's not aware, that the Medical Review Committee is struck by reaching a consensus on the part of the Medical Association, the College of Physicians and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Now our members of the Medical Association, the College of Physicians and representatives of the Manitoba Health Services Commission that sit on this Medical Review Committee, they've accepted to police themselves by that means. There are, as the honourable members are quite aware, a lay person sitting on that board; there was an amendment made to the act to allow a lay person to sit on the board, and that is the only official representative of government sitting on the Medical Review Committee. They police themselves and they discipline their own colleagues pertaining to whatever happens that seems to be out of the order in regards of charges made to patients and so on.

And I must say that the administration of such a committee is much less than what it costs the Department of Health and Social Development in regard to income security, i.e. the social

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . allowance recipients that are brought before the courts for fraud or for payments that are called back by the Department of Health and Social Development. The amount is much greater, the amounts that are asked by different positions in the Province of Manitoba is much larger than what we've asked social allowance recipients to pay back to the Crown.

The honourable member again made reference to the negotiations that are under-way between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association. I may have understood wrongly the honourable member, when he was seemingly asking me to show the government's stand pertaining to negotiations, and I don't think that would be fair if I, as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Health Services Commission, would show all of the hand that we have before us. If we are negotiating in good faith we don't expect the Manitoba Medical Association to tell us exactly at this stage what they want from us, and I don't think we as a department should tell the Manitoba Medical Association what our ultimate aim is at the end of the negotiations. That would not be negotiating in good faith. So in all due fairness, I can't answer the honourable member's question, and by that means inform the Manitoba Medical Association of our ultimate intent.

I would like to lay on the record again, because the honourable member made reference to some statistics in regards to medical practitioners in the province, and I would like to make reference to a table that again relates to medical practitioners that are fully registered in the Province of Manitoba with country of training and with the registration which dates back to 1963 up to September 30, 1972, and here I'm talking about Manitoba, Canada, the U.S.A., U.K., Europe, Asia and other countries of the world. In 1963 in Manitoba there were 26; in Canada 12; U.S.A. 4; the U.K. 25; Manitoba 26; U.K. 25; Europe 14; Asia 18; other countries 3. In 1964 Manitoba 30; 1965 32; 1966 20; 1967 18; 1968 32; 1969 32; 1970 37; 1971 34; and 1972 up to September 1972, 53. I'll give you the breakdown of the other countries . . .

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): . . . what he's talking about. I missed the first part. Were you talking about doctors per thousand or what? I mean. . .

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I was indicating the medical practitioners granted full registration in Manitoba with country of training, medical practitioners granted full registration in Manitoba with country of training: 1963, I indicated 26; Canada 12; U.S.A. 4; U.K. 25; Europe 14; Asia 18; and other countries in the world 3, for a total of 102. 1972--I'll jump the other years--if the honourable members would like other statistics for other years I could make these available. 1972, Manitoba 53 as compared to 26 in 1963; Canada 21 as compared to 12 in 1963; U.S.A. 6 as compared to 4 in 1963; U.K. 33 as compared to 25 in 1963; Europe 14 in 1963 12 in 1972; Asia 35 in 1972, 18 in 1963; other countries 11 in 1972, 3 in 1963; a total in 1963 of 102, for a total of 171 in 1972. For a grand total, in Manitoba registered from 1963 to September 30, 1972 of 314 in Manitoba; 135 that came from the U.S.A.; 42--I'm sorry, 135 from Canada; other provinces; 42 from the U.S.A.; 336 from the U.K. 86 from Europe; 258 from Asia; and 46 from other countries. And the other countries include Australia, New Zealand, Africa and South America - for a total of 1,217.

The honourable member asked me to give him and other members of the House information pertaining to professions. The number of general practitioners, specialists and other categories of physicians as of September 30, 1972: general practitioners, Metro Winnipeg 260; Brandon 23; rural 227; for a total of 510. Specialists in private practice: Metro Winnipeg 383; Brandon 33; rural areas 28; for a total of 444. Postgraduate: Metro Winnipeg 103; Brandon 2; rural areas 6; for a total of 111. Public service specialists: in Metro Winnipeg 144; in Brandon 3; in rural areas 5; for a total of 152. Public service, armed forces: Greater Winnipeg 7; none in Brandon; 8 in rural areas; for a total of 15. Not practicing, retired doctors: In Metro Winnipeg 59; in Brandon 1; in rural areas 7; for a total of 67. Doctors that are involved mainly in administrative responsibilities: Metro Winnipeg 6; none in Brandon; none in the rural areas; for a total of 6. Doctors that are practising on a temporary basis: Metro Winnipeg 65; none in Brandon; 11 in the rural areas; for a total of 76. As of September 30, 1972, there were 1,125 general practitioners and specialists in Greater Winnipeg; 73 in Brandon; 313 in the rural areas; for a total of 1,511.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry made reference to the Childrens Hospital Boards being somewhat reluctant in becoming part of the Health Science Board, the Health

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . Science Centre Board. I must inform the honourable member that they did so of their free will. They negotiated and they accepted to join the Health Sciences Centre Board and, according to my information, the working relationship of the Childrens Hospital with the Health Science Centre Board is working well; the services to children within that facility is as good, if not better, than prior to the amalgamation of different institutions under one board.

The Member for Fort Rouge made reference the other evening in regards to Social Allowance Dental Program I would like to give some information in regards to the negotiations that did take place with the Dental Association in regards to the fees paid for social allowance recipients and for those under our dental program, apart from social allowance recipients. In 1968-69 there was a grand total of \$315,000 paid to different dentists in the Province of Manitoba under that program; 1969-70 390,000; 1970-71 515,000; 1971-72 695,000 1972-73 \$700,000. And Mr. Chairman, that's more than a doubling of the amounts paid to dentists in the Province of Manitoba for social allowance recipients and others under our dental program.

The main reason for this increase is due to two factors: (a) a yearly fee increase; (b) increases in volume of clients. After many months of negotiation and after a meeting between the sub-committee of Cabinet of Health, Education and Social Planning, there was a schedule arrived at which became effective April 1, 1973, which gave an increase of 8 1/2 percent to the Dental Association for procedures performed for social allowance recipients and others under our dental program, and which gave them equally an increase of 5 percent for 1974-75 and 5 percent for 1975-76. There was an increase of 5 percent in 1969-70, a 5 percent increase in 1970-71, and a 5 percent increase in 1971-72. There was no increase in 1972-73 because we were negotiating, and this is the reason why we agreed to an increase of 8 1/2 percent in 1973-74. And I have the breakdown of each item that is now covered under the new agreement.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West briefly made reference to the White Paper. As the honourable member is quite aware, we are discussing the White Paper and its contents with many individuals in the Province of Manitoba; we're quite open to receive recommendations and suggestions in regards to what is spelled out within the White Paper on Health. We are discussing equally the regional delivery service for the Department of Health and Social Development. The start-up of the new system in Brandon, in the Brandon region, is not only being tested but is being the first to start in Manitoba. The other six regions in Manitoba will follow and hopefully that within 1973-74 we can have the regional concept across the Province of Manitoba in the seven regions.

The boundaries of the given regions remain quite flexible and this is the reason why we did not want to bring legislation, because we anticipate some changes within those boundaries and we would not want to actually freeze ourselves to a given set of boundaries that were actually drawn up a few years ago, I believe, by the Department of Industry and Commerce. So we do anticipate having some changes made within the boundaries of Brandon and others in the Province of Manitoba.

We are looking at the outcome of the studies being made in the Brandon region so that we can actually prevent bad reaction in other parts of the Province of Manitoba. I must inform the Honourable Member for Brandon West, for his information and the information of his constituents, that it is coming along quite well in the Brandon region; all those involved seem to be quite pleased with the outcome of the integration and the decentralization of services in the Brandon region.

The honourable member did indicate some concern about VON and their present and future role insofar as the Home Care program and in regard to the nursing homes becoming an insured service as of the 1st of July. I had a meeting with the association itself and I spoke to their annual meeting indicating that their present responsibility will not only continue but we, as a government, anticipate their responsibility to be increased quite a lot in the future. We know that the expertise is there and we're wanting them to--we did indicate to them that on the 1st of July that we would be adding an amount of 1.5 million within our estimates for Home Care services, and that we definitely needed VON and all their expertise to help us deliver a good Home Care program. I did meet equally with the officials of the Red Cross to make sure that their staff man years are equally well co-ordinated with VON,

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . with the Department of Health and Social Development, with different hospital boards across the province in Manitoba, to make sure that we have a good, sound co-ordinated service in regards to Home Care.

The honourable member was making reference to the dispensing of prescription drugs in nursing homes and what outlets would be used for the dispensing of drugs. The honourable member is quite aware of the policy of different hospital boards in the Province of Manitoba in regards to purchasing of drugs in bulk to supply their patients, and that in essence will be the policy, that the boards, whether they be amalgamated boards, amalgamated boards, say, of the hospital of additional levels of care, will be given that responsibility either through purchase in bulk or to purchase from the local pharmacist, like is happening today. We haven't got a mass purchasing agency and distribution agency so we can't dictate, and we can't offer an alternative to health facilities in the Province of Manitoba so that the system that is now being utilized say for hospital boards, for nursing home boards, will continue.

There will be an amendment to the Act presented very shortly that will actually not compel nursing home boards to have the same, say, specifications on the prescription in regards to the dispensing of drugs as long as those drugs are administered to patients within say a given health facility. When the patient is actually released from the health facility those sections within The Pharmaceutical Act will apply to them. But there is an amendment because it does not apply to, say, patients within the hospital facility and we want this to be extended to nursing home facilities and hostels.

In as far as the Brandon Correctional Institute is concerned we are still discussing with individuals in the local area and we are looking at the facility that we now have in Brandon. We haven't completely decided on the concept, on the physical facility itself, we haven't decided either definitely on the site. We're hoping to be able to, like I indicated a week or so ago in the House, to start construction of the Brandon Correctional Institute in 1973, and we are involving individuals in the Brandon area and it will tie in very closely with the Sprucewoods Camp and other facilities in the region.

The Sprucewoods Camp can be actually a multi-purpose facility. The honourable member, I believe, mentioned the possibility of continuing a longer treatment purpose with the Sprucewoods Camp in regards to chemical abuse and so on. That's something that will definitely have to be looked at with facilities that will become vacant once the new correctional institution in Brandon is a matter of fact. We haven't decided upon the old facility, which is by the way, I believe, the oldest jail in the Province of Manitoba; it is still quite sound and is well kept and we haven't decided what to do with it at this stage.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister accept a question? Is it established then, is it established that the present facility will be retained for some other use and purpose?

MR. TOUPIN: No it isn't really. It isn't decided exactly what will be done. I know at one time there were discussions with the City of Brandon in regards to that site, and I guess it'll be decided upon in regards to the future use of the land, and so on, and the needed use of that facility.

The honourable member posed a question in regards to detoxification centre, chemical abuse centre, in Brandon. I did mention that--well publicly and I believe in this House, that Brandon was proceeding quite well pertaining to our chemical abuse treatment approach in Brandon. The Brandon General Hospital will be the intake for those suffering of chemical abuse and the longer treatment facilities will come on stream as time goes on. We have a home I believe in Brandon--I'll give more details when I get to the specific item on my Estimates in regards to the number of patients that we can care for within that facility, and others that will be needed in the future. But that is the approach, not only in Brandon but that is the approach in Thompson, that is the approach in The Pas, in Greater Winnipeg, and so on, that the hospital will be the base for intake for acute treatment and then longer term treatment within a hostel facility, a half-way house facility. And by the way most of the costs for such facilities and operating expenses will be found within the budget of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Some of the details will be discussed there and the other part will be found under the amounts voted for the AFM board, and through them to other agencies that become involved in the treatment of those suffering of chemical abuse.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder - I just have one question there in that connection. Is the Minister suggesting that there will be additional beds provided in these

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. MCGILL cont'd). . . . hospitals in Brandon, The Pas, and Thompson in respect to the treatment of alcoholics and other drug problems, or is it merely modification of present beds that are there for this purpose?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, at this stage I have not had requests - a request for additional beds in the Brandon General Hospital for that purpose. I believe that the intake of those individuals can be met with existing facilities, but if that ever becomes a necessity we're definitely open to a, you know, to a recommendation on the part of the Manitoba Health Services Commission after they meet with the Hospital Board in Brandon.

The policy as the honourable member is probably aware in regards to nursing homes in the Brandon area is actually the same for the rest of the province, is that after we've completed discussions with different hospitals, different personal care home boards in the Brandon region, certain beds will be set aside as being beds available for extended treatment, not only for those 65 and over but for all those patients that will be referred by doctors to these longer treatment facility beds, and this will be covered to a given amount arrived at through negotiation with the different boards, anything over \$4.50 per day per patient will be covered by the Crown. But there will be a set amount, a maximum to be charged by the personal care board pertaining to each bed. There will be equally amounts set aside - not set aside - amounts set through negotiation for semi-private or private accommodation, the same as you see say with an acute care hospital, and that will be again determined by negotiation with the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the different personal care home beds or hostel facilities. I haven't got the amounts that will be actually determined for semi-private or private accommodation, but we will definitely allow for that and we will pick up a certain amount. But if a patient wants semi-private or private accommodation that will be available to him at his expense.

The honourable member asked a question on where are funds found for chemical abuse treatment. Well I indicated a while ago that this will be found under two appropriations. One under the Department of Health and Social Development and the other part under the Manitoba Health Services Commission's budget, which is approximately \$70 million. Mr. Chairman, I have more details to give later but I'll now sit and listen to some comments by other members of the House.

. . . . continued on next page

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, in response to a question posed by the Member from Brandon West the Minister seemed to - at least he gave me the impression that he was not familiar with the details of the proposed plan insofar as they apply to personal care homes, and I find this a rather startling admission coming from a Minister who has, with a great deal of fanfare, announced that they have a brave new world waiting for those who require personal care. I find it rather surprising that even preliminary discussions with the medical profession, who are very much involved in this program or who will become very much involved in this program in its delivery, and consultations with those people who are presently making up the various boards in the communities in which elderly persons' housing units are located and personal care homes are located. One would have thought that the very minimum that could be expected would be meaningful discussions with those groups before even a plan would be contemplated. I'm told that even those who are entrusted with the responsibility of bringing in this program in their discussions with communities are not aware of how the program will be implemented. One can only guess as to what will ultimately result from the Minister's announcement, and let me make it very clear, Sir, that the inclusion of personal care homes under the Manitoba Health Insurance Program is a program that we endorse. (Hear, Hear.)

But, Sir, there's a great deal of difference between the announcement of such a program and its successful implementation. And if we're to have assurances that this program is going to be put into operation in a manner that is satisfactory to the people across this province then the Minister has got a lot of questions to answer before we can accept his version of this kind of program.

One only can guess at the kind of bureaucratic thinking that goes in behind some of these programs, but I have never seen anything so typical of socialist planning as a statement that appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune of April 26th, 1973, and I suspect that this is the sort of computerized thinking that is going on with regards to the implementation of this program. I'm quoting from an article in the Tribune that appeared, as I said, on April 26th entitled, "Health Care Called Undemocratic." It goes on to say that a Professor of Sociology, a Robin Bagley of Toronto made this statement. He said, "Even with medical and health care insurance the rich get good health care and the poor don't. For example, city dwellers in Manitoba in contrast to the rural population have more operations, more physical examinations, and are in hospital more often." Well bully for them. The thought perhaps never occurred to him that there aren't as many hypochondriacs out in the rural areas as there are in the city. The thought probably never occurred to him that good healthful living out in the rural areas maybe made it unnecessary to see the doctors as often, or get operations as frequently, as is the case in the city. The congestion prevents a lot of accidents that occur in the city areas. He said, "Metropolitan Winnipeg residents in 1970 compared with those of rural parkland received twice as many general history and physical examinations." I might say that in the rural areas every time you have an ingrown toenail or boil on your backside they don't run into the hospitals and get ten days' treatment in the hospital. They had 2.5 more specialist consultations, were in hospital twice as often, generated 40 percent more medical care costs, and received 3.5 times more service from neurosurgeons. So what are they going to do? They are going to I suppose - the answer to that program from a socialist point of view is that they are going to drag those rural people into those hospitals, and they're going to remove some portion of that person whether they like it or not. They've got to equal this thing up. This egalitarian society has got to be equalized and whether or not there is a need for an operation by George the socialists are going to give him one because health care has got to be equal in all parts of this country. Well, Sir, this is a typical example of the kind of thinking that is going into this kind of program.

A MEMBER: We're going to have them in there before the election.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, they've established a ratio, and that ratio is 12 beds per 1,000 across this province. Now no consideration is given as to whether or not that ratio is applicable in equal force in the rural as opposed to the urban areas. Sir, there are, according to the census statistics, considerably more people living in the rural areas of the age of over 65 than there would be as a percentage of the population in the City of Winnipeg. Governments through their policies are evacuating the rural areas of the young people. Their policies are

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . driving young people into the cities. So as a consequence we have a larger percentage of older people in the rural areas than they do have in the cities. This policy, Sir, if implemented, is going to compel a lot of the rural communities to abandon personal care homes because according to this ratio there are more in some of those communities than the particular requirement, or the criteria that is being set up at the present time. That's ridiculous. Sir, if that is the criteria that is going to be established, and I am told that that is what the officials of the Department have told the people in the rural areas, then what we have is an inequity that defies description.

If the central registry is to be set up . . .

A MEMBER: And it will be set up.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . and people are going to be distributed throughout this province like cattle, it will of course mean that because of the additional facilities that will be constructed in the City of Winnipeg, because of the population ratio, according to age, there will be more in the City of Winnipeg than are really required. That means these local communities who have gone through considerable expense, and their own money, a great deal of it their own money, in building personal care homes, in providing the amenities and the services for elderly people in those homes, much of it, much of it, Sir, given by volunteers, people who do this work because they're interested in old people, because they're interested in the problems of those people, and because they want to provide for them the kind of service and the kind of care that will make them happy. And it has been a successful program. Throughout the Province of Manitoba when this program was brought in by the Roblin administration, it was one of those programs that was greeted with acclaim across the entire length and breadth of this province. Can the Minister honestly say that the application of such a formula will, say, apply to a town like Pinawa or Thompson in the same way as it applies to a town such as Steinbach or Carman? Of course not. Because the population in those two centres are a young population. Their requirements for personal care facilities are much less than they would be in a town such as Steinbach and Carman where there are many more older people as a percentage of the population.

Well now, Sir, the government continues to insist on inputs in their programs and they talk about it; they talked about it in the City of Winnipeg Bill 36, how much they wanted the people to become involved; they're talking about it on almost every occasion how people should become involved, but here is an instance where people have been involved, have been involved for many years. What is happening is that they are going to be discouraged from their efforts if this central registry is set up; if this centralized program is going to be brought into being, and the many worthwhile volunteer associations that have been assisting in maintaining these homes for a number of years are to be discouraged from carrying on that kind of work. Surely the Minister knows that for example in a community such as Steinbach there is ethnic background there that like to remain in that community because they have their friends there, because many of them speak a language that they came to this country with. In the community such as Notre Dame de Lourdes or Ste. Anne, many of those people are of French speaking origin, and they wish to remain in those communities because their friends and their relatives are there. Are we now through this central registry to have these people distributed whoever is responsible for this central registry, -- (Interjection) -- The commissar of health care. Are we to now assume that he is going to make a determination as to where these people will go other than in their own communities? -- (Interjection) --

A MEMBER: That's why they call it the premium.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, if this is the kind of program that we can expect the Minister to implement, then I can tell him right now that notwithstanding the needs, and notwithstanding the desirability of the objective, and the desirability of the principle behind this program, if that's the way it's going to be implemented, there will be resistance. It will come from every community that has a personal care home or even an elderly persons housing home. There's no way that that kind of centralized bureaucratic thinking is acceptable to the rural areas because it will remove these people. They're not satisfied to take the young people out of our communities, now they're going to take the elderly ones as well. And, Sir, that has to be rejected.

The Minister might also answer another question that is being posed to me, and is being regarded with a great deal of alarm in the rural areas, and that's the question of the 48 hour vacancy in the personal care beds.

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

MRS. TRUEMAN: Twenty-four.

MR. JORGENSEN: Does that mean now -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm giving the Minister the benefit of the doubt, my Honourable friend from Fort Rouge says 24 hours. Does that mean that if a person who is in one of these care homes decides to visit their sons or daughters for a Christmas weekend, or something of that nature, that when they come back their bed will be gone? Does that mean that when a person enters a hospital maybe for a checkup or a bit of treatment, they will not have a bed in that personal care home when they get back? Will be shipped off to Winnipeg, or some other point where they are not known, where they do not have any friends. Mr. Chairman, what kind of a traumatic experience is that going to be for those people? -- (Interjection) -- We have been -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, for a few days we have been enjoying the benefit of the absence of the Minister of Labour and I wish that -- and it's a pity that continued absence did not prolong itself for another few more days because you know we can get things done in this House when the Minister is not here. His continued interjections, displays and ignorance of the rules of this Chamber. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you know the Minister is one who continues to ask for all sorts of reforms. He's asked for land reform; he's asked for penal reform; he's asked for legislative reform; and he's asked for labour reform, but what the Minister really needs is chloroform.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of questions that remain unanswered insofar as this program of personal care home is concerned.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order, the Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: I've only been here for four years, five sessions now, and I find that some of the speeches of the Members of the Conservative Party are offensive to my sensibilities, and I think offensive to many people in Winnipeg, and I find the particular joke that the Member for Morris just made about the Leader, or rather the House Leader, Deputy House Leader and Minister of Labour, to be one of those distasteful and offensive jokes that the Conservative Party seems so much to enjoy. I find that any reference to a Member of this Legislature, any reference to anybody in this Province of Manitoba, as being someone that should be subjected to chloroform is most offensive, is disgraceful, and is really, Sir, I think, a joke, a joke that should be classed where it belongs with those followers of Adolph Hitler.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: And of course you will recognize that as not a point of order at all, and I am absolutely dismayed at the knowledge that I have offended my honourable friend's delicate sensibilities. His memory should go back just a week or two back, to I noticed on that particular occasion his sensibilities were not offended at all. The kind of rhetoric that was being used in this House by the Member for Flin Flon and the Minister of Labour on occasions. I find his sensibilities are selective, and one can only have sympathy for him because I don't want to offend him, so I will refrain from any further comment about the Minister of Labour whose sensibilities are not quite as delicate, and I'm sure that the Minister of Labour, notwithstanding the fact that we do exchange pleasantries from time to time in this Chamber, I don't think it is of a nature that either one of us are going to be that offended, and in case my honourable friend from Osborne missed the point I was simply attempting to point out to the Minister of Labour in a delicate way that if we heard less from him when other people were speaking we'd appreciate it more.

MR. PAULLEY: Carry on.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health has enunciated a program as I started out to say that in principle we do not disagree with, but I think that the province, and I think that this House, is entitled to some answers to some very serious questions as to how this program is going to be implemented. And we expect that before the implementation date that those answers will be forthcoming and the people of this province are going to have some idea as to whether or not their autonomy in the determination of where a patient will go and who will be admitted will be left up to those local communities, and to those local boards, who have carried on that responsibility in the past years and I might add carried it on very well and to the satisfaction of the people in those communities. Sir, we cannot tolerate the sort of thing that seems to have been placed in the minds of the communities in rural Manitoba by the officials who have been discussing this matter with them because they are fearful that they're going to lose what control they have now over the admission of those people who require the



## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . kind of care that is available to them in these homes. And I hope that the Minister will provide some answers and answers that will be satisfactory to everybody in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see the Minister is now finally anxious to answer some of the many questions that have been posed to him. I almost hesitate to speak because I notice there's only two Ministers in the House which would seem to indicate that there's a lack of interest by the front bench into what the Opposition has to say on one of the largest departments, spends I believe 35 percent of all the money collected in Manitoba, and there seems to be no interest on the government side. Very few backbenchers - a few minutes ago there was only three backbenchers there, there's more of them now, and I think that shows the real interest that's shown by the government in an important department which touches the lives of the most unfortunate in our society. There seems to be no interest other than making a speech and running out.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to give - toss a couple of more bouquets and roses towards the Minister regarding a few of the things that he's doing. One of the items that I'm going to be dealing with is his claim that he made yesterday, or was it Friday, that they have the lowest welfare caseload, I believe, in Canada. And if I'm wrong I hope he corrects me. I think that was the statement he made, and I want to say that that is dishonest, incorrect, as the figure that the Minister of Labour gave us when he said that they have the lowest unemployment rate, and I will deal with that to indicate how cleverly it was disguised by using public funds.

Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments about his outrageous and ludicrous statements about abortion. And I really see very little point of dealing with it except that he has made some statements and I think they deserve to be answered. I have today's copy of the Tribune and the quote is, this is the beginning of the article quoted by Mr. Toupin: "Removal of abortions from Medicare coverage would establish a double standard for the rich and poor, driving the poor to backroom abortions performed by quacks:" Health Minister Rene Toupin said. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a complete falsehood. He knows that's not right; he knows that legal abortions are cheaper than backstreet abortions. If we removed the abortions from Medicare today the abortions would continue to go on, the only difference would be that the Medicare would not pay for it. But the rates are established \$73.00 or \$68.00, or whatever it is. I'm told that the backstreet abortions are several times that amount, so why would any woman want to go to a backstreet abortionist, risk her health, and pay three times as much when she would be able to go to a Manitoba hospital and have it done perfectly legal and under the most sanitary conditions. And I simply don't understand why the Minister would resort to that kind of falsehood because he knows it's not true.

He also goes on to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the honourable member is treading on ground that he was treading on the other day. I think that the honourable member should reflect on just what he is saying. If he is accusing an honourable member of standing in this House and lying, or telling falsehoods, I think he should reconsider that. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, may I just reread the article "It would drive the poor to backroom abortions." Now if the Minister wants to get up and say that that's not true I'm prepared to accept his statement but it's not true. He has absolutely no grounds and no evidence to suggest that payment, personal payment for abortions would drive people to the back street abortionist. I mean why should they, why should a person, that poor person, who supposedly can't even afford to pay the hospital fee of \$67.00, why should he go to the back street abortionist? Does it make sense? Does it make sense? Well does it make sense? The member hasn't got an answer.

The second comment he made is that abortion applicants are governed by the federal law. Provincial governments are obliged to cover all permissible services (That is not true.) which must be equally available to all economic classes. Therefore it would be immoral to remove abortion from coverage, he said. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not true, but if it was, does that mean if they legalize abortion on demand, which could happen in the next couple of years, would that mean that we would have to pay for those abortions through Medicare, or would the Minister say then, that those we don't have to cover. Because the way he was defending the position yesterday he said, because it's a medical procedure having to do with

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . the health of a patient therefore it must be considered as a medical problem and paid for by Medicare. But under the Abortion on Demand Legislation which is being proposed by David Lewis and his gang, and the abortion group, they say for any reason. Now I'd like the Minister to tell us if we have abortion on demand, which will be for social reasons and other reasons, which have nothing to do with mental or physical health, will it still be under Medicare, or will he then say, this is extra, you're going to have to pay extra? I'd like the Minister to tell us about that. And I'd like to also indicate once again that abortion, the present abortion law is being abused, and it is being violated, and it is being broken. He knows it, and I will quote some people who have made that statement, Dr. W. H. Allemang, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Toronto, stated at the National Canadian Conference on Abortion, May 24th, 1972, that any unwanted pregnancy is now accepted as a reason for abortion, and that more than 99 percent of abortions are done without any medical reasons. Nobody in this country, no government has challenged that doctor, and he's not the only one that's made that statement. He has made that statement publicly; no government has challenged that. That means that the law is being broken, and I know the Minister knows that that law is being broken in Manitoba.

I am now reading from the Canadian Medical Association Journal. "By far the greatest number of abortions were performed on psychiatric social grounds." Canadian Press, and this is last year's story from the Tribune, I believe: "A countrywide survey by a Toronto based hospital journal indicates some hospitals are performing abortions in contravention of the Criminal Code and that legal abortions more than tripled in the first nine months of last year." The magazine said one Maritime hospital was performing abortions without a therapeutic abortion committee, and that other hospitals were performing abortions for social economic reasons.

Mr. Chairman, the section dealing with abortion in this country reads as follows: "To the pregnancy. If the pregnancy would, or would likely endanger the life or health of the mother." Now all doctors know that. The Minister knows. Those are the only grounds on which you can perform abortions. But all the evidence around us suggests that abortions are being done for other than those reasons, and we are paying for every single one, and as a matter of fact until I resigned, Mr. Chairman, the Minister without telling anyone was paying for abortions in New York which were illegal in this country, and he stopped because he was told to stop by the Cabinet at that time.

Now there's another magazine here, "Hospital Administration in Canada," and I quote: "It is worth noting that with two or three exceptions the number of applicants refused is fairly low. The reason given for refusing applications are perhaps best summed up by the medical director of a Vancouver hospital of over 500 beds who wrote, that they are based on the pregnancy being considered well past the time when termination would have been successful without posing a serious threat to the patient concerned." So in other words, Mr. Chairman, the law means absolutely nothing. The doctor will accept or refuse the abortion simply on the grounds of, is there a chance that he will lose that patient, because abortion is a very dangerous operation, performed after three months it's three times as dangerous as a pregnancy. So that is the only criteria that is used, and I think that the Minister should ask Dr. H. . . . . and Dr. . . . . , the main abortion doctors in Manitoba, I am told, at the General Hospital. Perhaps he should talk to them and they will tell him what are the reasons, what grounds they use for performing abortions.

Somebody said that they have to have this thing here because there is a question of the poor that will suffer. Mr. Chairman, I've done some research in Canada and I find out that only seven percent of all abortions are done for those on welfare which are largely poor, not all. I know some women drawing welfare who are shackled up with a guy who's making 800 a month but because of the present legislation his department has to pay them welfare. I don't know how many there is, how many cases there is, but there are such cases. In any event only seven percent of the poor are availing themselves of the abortion services, which are all paid for, paid for, and they can get it almost on demand. And there's another eleven percent that are abortions for the people under the 6, 000 or 5, 000 income bracket. And the largest number of abortions are performed on businesswomen, professional women. So their argument that abortion is for the poor and we would be discriminating or hurting the poor by taking it out from under Medicare, Mr. Chairman, is simply false. — (Interjection) — No. The statistics indicate that. My opinion doesn't count. We're dealing with a medical problem, and we're

## HEALTH - SUPPLY

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . dealing with a hospital problem, and both the hospital administrators and the doctors have made their comments. Nobody has challenged their statements, so what I say means nothing, but I think we should pay attention to what they say.

Another problem that the Minister should look at - New York State a 15-month study put out by the New York State Department of Health covering the months since abortion was legalized indicate that of the 400,000 babies surgically aborted, 1,800 was born alive and left to die. We know that there are babies born in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and they're allowed to die. They are thrown in a bucket. The doctors don't have the courage to kill them so they leave them, as that couple left it in that John Hopkins Hospital that I talked about the other day, they leave them there until they starve to death or they simply die from exposure, and I think the Minister should look into that question also.

The other question we should deal with, because the Minister stated yesterday that I was using twisted logic to debate the question, and I would like the Minister to indicate whether he agrees that that's a human being on that brochure, and if that's a human being then how can he say that I am using twisted logic. Either it's human or it's not human. Does he agree it's human? Does he agree with the medical assertion that on the 21st day that the heart is beating in that fetus? And if there's a heart there it must be human. Would he agree that it's human? Would he agree that that 21 week old baby is human? That he is so casually passing off as a medical procedure and therefore none of our business on this side.

And, Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I listened to the Minister giving his defence of why he has to allow these things to continue - I think he said that is the law of the land regardless of how I personally feel, and regardless of my bringing up, that is the law of the land and I'm a Minister and I have to carry out the policy, etc., etc. You know, Mr. Chairman, I read the book "The Nuremberg Trials", and when I listened to the Minister's excuses I would swear that I was sitting at the Nuremberg Trials because that is precisely the defence that was put up by the SS officers all the way down to the guy who was stoking the furnace at Auschwitz and all the other camps. Their argument was that it was the law, and indeed it was the law, no question about it. All the things that Hitler did were quite legal, just as the Communists telling the Jews you've got to pay \$38,000 for your education before you emigrate to Russia, it's quite legal, quite legal. But the world doesn't accept it, and we have had many protests from Ottawa, and I understand from Manitoba, saying that it's a terrible thing to do. Well he is basing his whole defence on the fact that it's legal. Mr. Chairman, on that basis we should turn around and canonize Hitler and Stalin and all the other butchers in the past, because they were clever enough to make laws, and saying it's legal, and if he's going to sit there and say that Ottawa says so, and it's government policy, and it's my duty to obey the law, then I don't know how we can turn around and condemn what happened in Germany because they were very practical. As a matter of fact they were more practical than our government. They were picking up the useless people, the medical cases, the cripples, the mental, physically defective, the ones that were, I think Hitler called them, "the useless eaters" and those people which required a high degree of medical attention. And there's no question that this was true. So he got rid of all of them because there would be more doctors and more medicine and more food for the Germans, and when the war started, for the soldiers. And on those very practical grounds they very easily defended their case, and listening to the Minister here he did the very same thing.

Another interesting aspect, Mr. Chairman, was the government hiring Father Berrigan to teach at the university. Well Father Barrigan is a Catholic, and I find it difficult to talk about a Catholic, particularly a priest, because we are taught that one must never criticize a priest unless they step out of line from church teachings, Rome teachings. That priest went into Washington files, they sacked government files, they burned, they destroyed, they poured blood, and I believe after all of these things here he was brought in to trial and was given a pretty darned fair trial, and he was sentenced to two years in jail. He served some time, and I think he's out on bail. He is now hired by the government--that terrible lawbreaker is now hired by the government, or paid for by the government, sorry, hired by the university, paid with our tax money. He's going to teach at the university. Mr. Chairman, when I made the statement I wasn't going to pay income tax because it's going for child murder, I was told by a couple of the government side that I was no better--and I won't use the term that they used--but they indicated that that was a terrible thing for a member in my position to openly

## HEALTH - SUPPLY

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . violate the law, that they thought that was terrible. But they are the ones that egged on and assisted those who are draft dodging, the army deserters, and now to add insult to injury they have hired a person who has gone out and destroyed the records, the military draft records in Washington. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, what this government would do if we did the same thing, if what was suggested in Regina a couple of weeks ago happened here, where the people said why don't we go into the hospitals, take all the records, doctors' records, and the medical records, and hospital records, and do the same thing that Father Berrigan did, destroy them, burn them, throw blood all over it, and just occupy the hospital the same way as the Berrigan priest did in the United States. I wonder what the response would be from that government. I'll bet you they'd call out the military the way Trudeau did against the FLQ in 1970, and they wouldn't blush about it--and I must add I don't think they're capable of blushing after four years in office. --(Interjection)-- That's why I left, that's why I left.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal any more with the abortion issue because I know that it's futile. I simply wanted to make those comments to indicate how the Minister was deliberately misleading the House by stating the facts that he did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I will read Citation 154 (5) to the honourable member. "It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue but it is unparliamentary to say it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House." Now I think the honourable member should withdraw that remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm tired, I don't want to argue with you, I'll withdraw that remark and I'll simply say that in my opinion, in my opinion he was misleading the House and he can get up and make whatever comments he wants.

Now I'd like to deal with the figures that he gave, and he hasn't indicated by the nod of his head that I was wrong, so I would like him to--I'd like to deal with the figures he gave us yesterday that they had the lowest welfare caseload in Canada. The Minister of Labour made the same comment, and at that time I tried to get some information out of the Minister to see how much of those artificial, artificially induced figures resulted from using public funds to create make-work projects, and he was offended by that because he went back --(Interjection)-- he said, well that's what Bennett did in the 1930's, and we're certainly not going to do that type of thing. And then he went on, he went on to indicate that they are paying these people in these various projects about \$90.00 a week, and I said at that time if they are desirable projects that's fine. But I see no difference between his program and Bennett's, except Bennett's paid \$5.00 a month, Bennett the first, and Bennett the second is paying \$90.00 a week, and there is absolutely no difference because the people who were employed by Bennett were doing useful work, as the Minister of Labour said that he was, useful work, and the Minister also stated that the people that they have on \$90.00 a week is useful work. So there is no difference, Mr. Chairman, except one was getting \$5.00--was getting paid \$5.00 a month and now they're getting paid almost \$400.00 a month, and by using public funds, creating some of these useless jobs, and I've indicated what they are, they managed very cleverly to reduce unemployment to around five percent. The real figure, Mr. Chairman, according to my figures, is close to eight percent, and the figures that the Minister of Health has given us about low welfare load is phony, because he did precisely the same thing, he used government funds to take people off welfare and put them on these projects, just so he can get up in the House before an election and say what a terrific guy I am. "You know, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to tell the Opposition and the people of Manitoba we have achieved the lowest welfare caseload in Canada." Well, Mr. Chairman, that is really incredible that they should stoop, that that bunch of puritans should stoop to that level that they would get up in this House and make that type of statement.

About a year and a half ago I talked to a couple of the Ministers and I said, look here's a couple of projects that were--the people complained about. They feel that it's useless projects, the guys are just killing time. And I complained to the Minister and he said, "Look would you rather they'd be on welfare?" --and of course everybody knows my view on welfare in this House. So I said, "No, I would think that anybody who is able-bodied should work, but I said if you're going to put them taking a stone from one place and putting it in the other one and putting it back, that type of thing, like they used to have in jails, breaking rocks and moving them from pile to pile, it's better they should be on welfare. If he's not producing any more, he's absolutely useless to himself, he's useless to society, and it's costing us not ninety some

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . dollars per month as you'd get on welfare, but it's costing us almost \$400.00 a month." And that Minister's reply was, "Well would you rather them be on welfare?" And I thought maybe that they would change their policy, and maybe they would think about that. Why pay a man \$400.00 to do nothing when you can pay him \$95.00 to do the same thing? Not realizing that all this time there was a clever diabolical almost plot to work up to a point where they can come in just before an election into this Legislature and throw the figures in the face of the Opposition and say, "Look what us socialists managed to achieve after four years." And if that was true, Mr. Speaker, I would have very great difficulty voting against them. If they really did it honestly putting people into productive work. But it's phony, Mr. Speaker. The figures that the Minister of Labour gave us are phony, artificial; the figures that the Minister of Health gave us are phony.

The Premier admitted yesterday that they've got winter works and emergency programs--there's \$13.4 million, and they give us a breakdown of how much was that for these make-work projects. We know that other departments have funds that they are using to create work to take people off welfare, and they are done deliberately to mislead the public that there is a problem in this province. Deliberately, Mr. Chairman. And the Minister of Health has the nerve to come in here and indicate that he has really made a breakthrough, which seems unbelievable. I mean if you look at the surface of their announcement it's --(Interjection)-- No, I've indicated to the Ministers the programs that are complained of, and I will tell you, I will tell again. One of them was they were picking papers along Highway No. 6 when there was four feet of snow. Now you tell me--I'd like the Minister of Municipal Affairs to get up and tell me if he thinks that that is a useful project to pay \$90.00 a week. Let him get up and say so. One of the PEP projects, picking up papers. --(Interjection)-- Pink paper no doubt. Mr. Chairman, this is the type of gimmickry that the government has used cold bloodedly, diabolically, deliberately to mislead the public so they can turn around and last through a bunch of votes at election time. I think it's a disgrace, and I think they are a disgrace to a party, which I still believe is a good party. But those guys are a disgrace to that party who spent 40 years in the wilderness working and being insulted, being called communist, being called every name under the sun, after all that to bring them into office and to have pervert the whole system. They are guilty in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, they are guilty of the worst type of gimmickry that I have seen in this country. The Conservatives were terrible, and the Liberals are terrible in this House, but they have done nothing that approaches what this government has done, and for what? Just to win an election. How cynical can you get?

Mr. Chairman, there are several other items I would like to talk about. I would like the Minister to get up and answer some of the questions before we get into some of the other issues about his paper on jail abolition. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: The Honourable Member wants to ask a question.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Would the Honourable Member submit to a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with at least two members of the House in the 15 minutes that I have at my disposal.

The first one would be the Honourable Member for Morris, and I believe the Honourable Member for Morris is not only eager but quite able to recognize those that he considers uncapable, unknowledgeable, but himself. When the honourable member made reference to myself as Minister of Health not being knowledgeable of the policy pertaining to Personal Care Coverage as of the 1st of July, he knows quite well that the policy of the government was spelled out quite clearly. I've indicated in the House, I've indicated outside of the House on many occasions, that we haven't set the rates for different levels of care within hostels, within personal care homes, and different levels of care being offered in acute care hospitals, that's known. And if we had had set these rates before talking to the hospital boards, before talking to the personal care boards, before talking to the hostel boards that we have in the Province of Manitoba, that would have been complete stupidity, before looking at the levels of care that are being offered within personal care facilities, and the honourable member knows that. What

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . we do know, and what we've said in this House on more than one occasion, is that we have within our estimates an amount of \$9.65 million.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to rise on a point of order, but I do think that the Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. If the honourable member . . .

MR. TOUPIN: . . . order a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER!!

MR. TOUPIN: Well, wait till I finish and then I'll get your question. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order. Right. The Honourable Member on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, if I can't get the floor any other way. The Minister is now referring to rates, and in my remarks I never mentioned rates. My remarks dealt with another subject altogether. Not once during the course of my remarks did I deal with rates at all, and he . . . try to mislead me, or mislead the House into a blind alley, because that is not the subject matter of my remarks in the first place. Deal with the questions that I asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. No point of order before the House, just a dispute of facts between members. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, if the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, was not making reference to the rates, what the hell was he mentioning? Because when we talk of personal care coverage we are talking of rates; and when we talk of coverage of all health facilities in the Province of Manitoba being unique in North America, we are talking of setting rates, and we are talking of putting an amount within the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development, and that amount within the estimates is \$9.65 million; and the amount that we will cover is anything above 4.50 a day after certain controls have been imposed. What does the honourable member want? He wants us to impose things to different boards in the Province of Manitoba. We will not do that. That's not the way we operate. We will discuss with the boards, we will arrive at rates that are acceptable for the care that's being given within that facility--and in case the honourable member wants to learn a few things in this House, there are certain levels of care being offered now in personal care homes and not in others, and that has to be determined. Why don't you listen and learn a few things equally.

Not only you can talk with the voice of John Diefenbaker. I can talk and be heard too. --(Interjections)-- I can speak better German than John Diefenbaker can speak French.--(Interjections)--

Mr. Chairman, after we've consulted with the different boards in the Province of Manitoba, and different levels of care, and after the efforts are co-ordinated by different boards, the rates will be set with the level of care being given by the different facilities. It will not be imposed by the government, it will be set after consultation. Consultation is now taking place between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the different boards, hospital boards, personal care boards--by the way, for the honourable member's knowledge, up to three levels of care within the personal care facility--different levels will be set; maximum will have to be set, amounts for private care, for semi-private care will be set. There's no way that we are going to prevent someone from staying in the Fort Garry Hotel or the International Inn with a private nurse, but he'll have to pay for that care. No way are we as taxpayers going to pay for that. But we can't prevent that. Maybe that's what the honourable member would like. --(Interjection)--

In the last four years, Mr. Chairman, we can put our record right next to the record of the Conservatives in the last ten years, pertaining to the construction of personal care beds in the Province of Manitoba, pertaining to the construction of hospital facilities in the Province of Manitoba. Any day--I can bring you statistics in this House putting our record forward and being ahead of the Conservatives, in four years --(Interjections)-- as compared to their ten years.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear. That wouldn't have been very hard.

MR. TOUPIN: They can talk about rendering services to the people of Manitoba at different levels of care. Let the facts be put on the record, and let the people of Manitoba decide.

The honourable member makes reference to a centralized registry. I don't know what the honourable member is talking about. Is he talking about the possibility of co-ordinating

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . efforts of different boards in the Province of Manitoba? At no time did we as a department, at no time did we as a government, say that we wanted to take the responsibility of different boards, pertaining to any level of care in Manitoba. When we talked of different boards, the hospital boards, the personal care boards, the hostel boards, co-ordinating their efforts, and if they accepted to come under one umbrella, that was an option to them; if they want to remain autonomous and take their decisions, that's up to them, we're not going to force that decision. If they decide to have a community health and social development centre in their region, or their district, or their town, that's up to them. And there will be boards appointed, elected, in the locality to take those decisions; admissions and discharges will be controlled by the same means as we see within the hospital setting today. Who decided what patient is admitted to a hospital bed today? Who decides when that patient will be discharged? --(Interjection)-- The member says, "doctors". For the information of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, there are admissions and discharge committees in the Province of Manitoba that are given that responsibility; and for his information, Mr. Chairman, I will bring forward their responsibility in regards to that function, and in regards to the medical profession.

I can see that we all have to learn. Let's not say that --(Interjections)-- you know, that only I is knowledgeable, the other person is stupid, doesn't understand. --(Interjections)-- Surely the honourable member knows after looking at the record of this government in the last four years that we see the difference between Steinbach and Ste. Anne des Chenes in regards to the aspirations of the people in those areas. Why did we accept to construct facilities and answer to the ethnic background of those people? We accept that. Our building projects in the last four years has proven that. The staffing of our offices have proven that. --(Interjection)-- We'll deal with . . . one when time comes. The honourable member knows that.

I'd like to set the record straight in regards to the comments made by my former colleague in Cabinet, the Member for Thompson. He is saying that I have said that we had the lowest social allowance recipients in Canada. I wish the Honourable Member for Thompson would listen--I had the courtesy of listening to his remarks --(Interjections)-- I don't know who's talking to who. --(Interjections)-- What I did say--I never said Mr. Chairman, that we had the lowest number of social allowance recipients in Canada. What I said during my remarks was exactly this. I could read the pages that refer to that: I mentioned major items of saving occurred in social allowances where we expect to spend \$4.4 million, under budget largely, in social allowance. I said that, and it's happening, that's the amount. We're not throwing out goodies, -we're not telling people, you know, we're good guys, we're cutting down people on welfare. That's the amount that will be actually underspent in 1972-73 in social allowance, that's a fact. And I said --(Interjection)-- and I said, because of the success and job creation undertaken by this government, largely--not because of the philosophy and the direction of the Federal Government. On the contrary, I attacked the Federal Government at the last conference of welfare ministers for their position and their philosophy pertaining to unemployment. In this context, I said, "Let me say something about our social allowance programs. In absolute figures the number of social allowance recipients carried on our welfare rolls have gone down by some 800 cases," that's what I said, "from January 1972 to January 1973. We now have on provincial rolls under 27,000 cases. I would estimate that this represents approximately 55,000 persons, or just about 5.5 percent of the province's population!" I submit, Mr. Chairman, I said, "that this is one of the lowest, this is one of the lowest figures of social allowance recipients of any province in Canada."

MR. BOROWSKI: And I gave you the reason why.

MR. TOUPIN: No, you didn't say that. Read your remarks. --(Interjection)-- I didn't say a false statement, that's true, that's a fact, that's a fact.

Let's go to abortions. Again I think I was misquoted in my remarks. I don't think the honourable member should rely on what he reads in the papers at all times. --(Interjections)--

I said, Mr. Chairman, in regards to abortion, that I know to begin with that persons applying for abortions are governed by federal law. Those applying for abortions are governed by federal law. I said that, and that's true. The honourable member can't deny that --(Interjection)-- Nothing, nothing can be done provincially, either to abet or to hinder that process at this stage, nothing can be done to abet or to hinder them. I said that, that's what I said pertaining to our responsibility. Does that mean that I as a person, I, Rene Toupin, as the MLA

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . for Springfield, agree with the federal law on abortions? No, that doesn't mean that. Does that mean, Mr. Chairman, that I have to do what the honourable member did and resign from Cabinet, resign from caucus, just because I happen to have a feeling that's contrary to the federal law? --(Interjections)-- No. Mr. Chairman, I would like to--I would like to contend that while I was in a co-operative movement I disagreed with a position that was taken within that movement, and it took me ten years to have that corrected. I feel that I can contribute more by being within than being withdrawn from a process of government that will help change positions that we don't agree with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 5:30 o'clock, I'm leaving the Chair and return at 8:00 p. m. this evening.