

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, May 3, 1973

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge who has four minutes.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry the Minister of Health and Social Development isn't here. I had promised him -- did he hear me wherever he is? --(Interjection) -- Oh. I had promised that I would find the Hansard which I referred to earlier in the afternoon concerning whether he felt there was a need for more day care centres in the Province of Manitoba. The Hansard for April 6th, 1973, page 1451 and Mr. Toupin says: "Mr. Speaker, during the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development," this is in response to a question. "there will be details spelling out programs in regards to day care facilities. With the program that will be announced in the Estimates I don't see any need for legislation to actually encourage the development of more day care centres in the Province of Manitoba."

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, in no way does that statement of mine, or that answer that I gave to the honourable member of the House that asked me the question, say that I'm against more day care centres. I am indicating that the Estimates will reveal a day care program in the Province of Manitoba and that I saw no need for legislation dealing with day care, with day care facilities. And I still don't, but that doesn't mean I'm against more day care centres. On the contrary.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I guess we read different things into different items. While the Minister has made this remark -- now I'd like to know under what item he --oh it's under the \$500,000 item. That's right. . . bring it up now; we haven't heard the details yet. Well I really am about finished, Mr. Chairman.

I did want to ask the Minister to tell us some more about his plans for nursing home beds. There's still some puzzlement on my part because the costs, the per diem costs of nursing homes vary a great deal, and he has said that everyone will pay the \$4.50, but now I want to know whether he's going to pay more for some beds than others and also with the waiting list that exists at the present time, could he give us some idea of what they will be, whether he feels that the nursing home beds that are ready will be sufficient or whether there will be more ready soon, because I'm certain that there will be many more applications.

The Minister when he was in the east had -- there had been some discussions of improving the Canada Pension Plan, particularly as it related to women, and I noticed that he had asked that widows be given greater benefits, or survivors, and I wonder if he wouldn't go just a little farther than that, given another opportunity. The Status of Women Commission in their report recommended that the spouse who remains at home during the -- doing the home work, looking after the home, should also be able to participate in the plan, that she should be able to perhaps pay into it, or share in a portion of her employed spouse's contributions, or perhaps contribute as a self-employed worker. The problems come of course when a couple who may have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member's allotted time has expired. Does the honourable member have leave? Leave?

MRS. TRUEMAN: All right, I'll just finish this item. Sometimes a marriage, after the children have grown up and left the home, will break up. The family may have stayed together under a great deal of tension while those children were growing up but at the point then where the couple are separated or divorced, the woman loses any claim on the man's Canada Pension Plan and she has no pension plan of her own to fall back on. If she could participate as an individual in the Plan this would perhaps save a woman from falling into that sort of misfortune, and also of course if there's a separation she doesn't benefit. I'll leave it with that for the moment, Mr. Chairman, and not impose on your good nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 (a)(1) -- the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on the Estimates of the Department on Health and Social Services, and on the introduction of his Estimates I was quite interested in all the improvements that the Minister has suggested and will be proposing to the House by way of Legislation in respect to increasing the expenditures in a way for food, clothing, and for people that need it. And really, Mr. Chairman, there's very little that we can argue about in removing the drug costs for our senior citizens and improving the pensions because I believe in this area much of this perhaps has been overdue.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . . .

So I will not take too much time to concern myself in respect to this area because I believe what we should really concern ourselves with in this department, is there any duplication in the way of expenditures that perhaps is going on at the present time and the department is - it's such a large department one would have to almost be an expert in every field to know if there is. Because welfare has become a loaded work, Mr. Speaker, with a lot of public expense and public concern. And again it has never been proven that welfare reduces poverty. A special Senate Committee on poverty in Canada has suggested that a social welfare system has outlived its usefulness and that it has been to some extent a failure. I believe the intent in my opinion of welfare is a good one, but the problem and the fault is maybe the system is misunderstood to some extent and the relationship with the community.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called welfare cancer does not refer to the deserving poor, the blind, the disabled, or the aged, but perhaps to the others who do not need it. We have, Mr. Chairman, the myth of relevancy of the work effort. I believe that to a certain extent our attitude about welfare have been built in middle-class bias, but in my opinion the poor really need assistance and so I cannot argue with the areas that it's deserving that it should be given to.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will concern my remarks to another area and that is one where I believe that there is a real serious lack and where surveys have revealed a real serious lack of knowledge concerning family planning among many of our people, men and women, and in many instances there's been express need, express for availability of more information in this field. Many of the low income families and young women do not have a private consultant, or a private physician, to consult him on these matters. I know last year that I did take a few minutes to talk on this issue and I wanted to do that again now. I believe women are concerned about family planning, and I know that abortion has been debated to a great extent in this House, and perhaps we should concern ourselves to more family planning and there wouldn't be this great concern about abortion. I know even doctors and ministers feel the same way that there should be more family planning clinics in this respect, and I do not believe that the government has moved in that area to the extent that it should.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I mean could he - is he in a position to indicate whether he is generally in support of the Royal Commission Report on the Status of Women and the most recent Annual Submission of the Provincial Council of Women, advocating that abortion be taken out of the Criminal Code entirely without qualification?

MR. PATRICK: Well, I wonder if the Minister asked me if I was aware or did he say did I agree? --(Interjection)-- No I would not at this time.., indicate if I am in full agreement, but I can say to the Minister that in Winnipeg alone I understand 21 percent of the live births in 1972 were illegitimate and it is estimated that the cost of supporting these people is quite expensive, to have them on welfare is about \$2,000 a year, while as compared to perhaps \$10.00 per family to provide family planning information for people. So --(Interjection)-- 21 percent. Last year only 1 1/2 cents was spent per person in all of Canada on family planning. --(Interjection)-- A total - that's right. So in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, certainly this is not enough and we're doing very little. Not only in this province, but perhaps in the Federal Government as well, is doing very little as far as family planning is concerned. And --(Interjection)-- yes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would encourage the free distribution of contraceptive information as well as contraceptive material?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, I would.

Mr. Chairman, the other point is I understand that most Canadian religious leaders in this country as well have concerned themselves with this problem and have said that family planning information is a much better method than abortion.

A MEMBER: . . . submit to another question?

MR. PATRICK: Well I would like to complete because I'll continue --(Interjection)-- I believe that in my opinion that this government must give urgent consideration and desirability of establishing proper family planning clinics within existing medical facilities, Mr. Chairman.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) This is an area that I think has been in my opinion neglected to a great extent.

The other point I wish to briefly touch on and concern myself with, Mr. Speaker, on a denticare program for our children in Manitoba, and I'm talking about a comprehensive dental program for children between the ages of three to sixteen. I believe that this is vitally essential to the health of the 70 percent or approximately 156,000 of our children in that age group which are now, or at the present time, have inefficient care. I know that the Minister has suggested that he'll be establishing a committee to look into this matter and I asked him the other day. He said it was an interdepartmental committee that will be looking into this area, and I was not able to get a report from him how long this study will continue or how long it'll take, so I believe that this is an area that government can move in without too much difficulty.

I believe that dental care should be considered as a part of a complete medical care program, to provide dental care to our children irrespective of income of the families or the people. If we agree that every citizen must be accorded equality of opportunity, then we must certainly agree that our citizens must be accorded equality of access to proper health treatment, because, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out before that maybe that a family may -- in one household there may be three or four children that need the type of medical attention concerning their teeth that it may cost as much as \$1,500 per child, and that family may not be able to afford 4,000 or 5,000 dollars and is it right that these children should go . . . proper medical attention.

From my information that I was able to acquire, it is my information that only 30 percent of our children can afford to avail themselves to a program of a regular dental hygiene. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe this is good enough. What are the results of a limited dental care? I believe that everybody knows, infected teeth, and perhaps missing teeth, because of inability to properly digest food, and so on.

I would like to outline, Mr. Chairman, a proposal under the following schemes: the type of care that is necessary, method of delivery, and implementation. I feel firstly that we need a diagnostic and preventative program in addition to the normal treatment of acute conditions. We also need a restoration of a primary and permanent teeth to good form and function; maintenance of proper spacing in the mouth to provide a normal bite. What I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman, is diagnostic and preventative care for children at a young age, and it's been proven that in the State of Iowa, I believe, where this has been now a program in practice for quite some time, then after the children get to adult age the dental costs are reduced anywhere in the neighborhood between 30 and 35 percent by just giving the proper attention to children's teeth with a preventative and diagnostic care. And it doesn't have to be a dentist - I understand that many of the hygienists in the dentists' offices can carry out this type of inspection and do that type of -- give that type of care.

I believe that the plan should be on a fee for service basis for the private practitioners and on a seller's basis for the clinic staff.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that it would be wrong to say that the program can be implemented within a year or two years. I believe it would take some time because of the manpower, and if we are talking for children between ages of three and sixteen. I believe it could be extended later on to elderly and the poor and then a complete comprehensive program, but it could be done by an increment system where on the first year basis you could have say the age of three and four, and the next year increase that to three, four, five and six, and for an increment basis I don't think that would allow us to have enough dentists, sufficient number of dentists, to implement the whole program through an increment basis.

But the other point I would like to raise, if the Minister would check at the number of dentists we had in this province say, ten years ago and the number we have today, the increase is very small, very small, and I would like to ask the reason why. The demand seems to be there. Are they not staying in the province, or what is the problem, or are we not graduating enough dentists? I haven't got the figure in front of me but I looked at it the other night and the figure, there's just a very small increase, it's unbelievable, you know through a period of ten years. So there must be a reason that we're either not graduating enough dentists, or the other point is they're not staying in the province, and I don't know which.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to be that most dentists are situated in practices in the City of Winnipeg and you have large communities, even the size of

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) Portage la Prairie where I understand you may have one or two dentists in the size of a community of Portage la Prairie, which is not enough. There must be again some program carried out that we would have sufficient dentists in rural centres as well. I know that some people will say, well what will the cost be, and I have a journal dentistry, a journal from the State of Iowa; there's an article on it that diagnostic and preventative care costs per child is between 30 and 40 dollars per child per year. And the reduction is anywhere up to 36 percent in dental cost projected for the State of Iowa in their comprehensive diagnostic and preventative care that they have had in there.

So I hope that the Minister will give this serious consideration and not give us a report which will state it will take another three or four years to complete his studies. I think the program will require some health measure on the part of the province to help provide fluoridation of water supplies in larger rural centres, an all-out dental public health program, a co-ordinated training program for dental hygienists and dental assistants, and extended laboratory services and preventative education would be required, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the province and the Federal Government should supply the funds in the form of low interest loans so that integration of dental health services could be achieved as outlined.

Mr. Chairman, another point that I want to raise with the Minister, and I have done on almost every occasion that I had an opportunity, and this is not a problem that has occurred recently, it has been going on for quite some time, and that's in respect to adoption procedures as they apply to my constituency of Assiniboia. And again I haven't got my file with me but I've had many discussions with the Minister and I wish to express my appreciation to him, he's trying to do everything possible, but I would like to see the whole Greater Winnipeg in the same area in respect to adoption. Because Assiniboia is in the Interlake region, or in the Interlake area, and the families will have to wait anywhere between two to three years before they can get their adoption procedures approved, while other parts of the city it may take anywhere from three to four months or less. This problem has existed not only under this Minister, it has existed quite a few years ago under Jack Carroll, and I'm sure that even the First Minister's aware of that because I know that some of my constituents have written to him.

Right now in my office I must have at least half a dozen recent letters that came to my attention within the last few weeks but every year I receive that many in respect to adoption procedures and the reason the people are concerned, and they figure the procedures are not fair, because they may have friends living in the other part of the city where their application is approved within a few months while the people in Assiniboia who are in the Interlake region have to wait anywhere from two to three years or sometimes longer. I know that the system has not been working and surely the Minister should change it. I believe that the whole Greater Winnipeg area should be put into one region where everybody will be treated the same. In fact perhaps the whole province should be treated the same, on some basis, on priority basis who comes first, but certainly it's not fair that one part of the city people can get their applications approved and the other part of the city someone has to wait quite a few years. I ask the Minister to give this very serious consideration because again, as I said, I haven't got my file with me but I have it in the office and I've had discussions with him on this matter.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is I would like to know what is the policy of the government in connection with the day care centres and day care program. I know that it's brought to my attention that the Homemaker's Services in many instances do not apply where there is only one child in the household. I want to know if this is correct where the mother wants to go to work, or the Homemaker Services applies when there is a certain number of children in the family. But there is great concern about many people at the present time that there isn't sufficient funds supplied as far as the day care programs are concerned, the day care centres in the province. Now again let me point out that in this department it costs much money is spent and I'm not qualified to say how much duplication we have and how much money is spent unnecessarily, but perhaps the Minister can give us some indication as far as duplication of programs are concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 (a) (1) -- The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): . . . say a few words on this department. I think it would come under the Minister's Salary because there's no particular heading for this, but it was brought to my attention and, in fact, I think there was a bill brought in by the government giving first reading on this particular subject, and then the government two years ago

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) dropped this bill and nothing more was heard about it.

What I want to discuss is the appointment of the deputy minister to the Department of Health and Social Development, and I'm not talking about the individual man himself, I'm talking about the law as it now stands. The law as it now stands states that the deputy minister must be a medical doctor, and the government did progress, as I mentioned, to bring this bill into the House about two years ago to make it possible for a layman to be the Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development. And then they dropped it, they dropped the bill, they didn't carry it through; we all thought they were going to pass it, to make it legal, but they dropped this, and the man who is now responsible for the Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development has no authority under the law to be the Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development, but yet the government - all that remains - and this is the second man, second layman, in that position who has held the position of the Deputy Minister.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that governments must do, and if ever Watergate was an example - and this isn't a scandal, this is a breaking the law, it is a case of the government breaking the law, and they're the ones that should respect the law and uphold the law, and show the people of the Province of Manitoba that they are the ones who have to be looked up to in every instance. -- (Interjection) -- Watergate. And I'm not jumping the gate. I gave you four years; I went through four years -- (Interjection) -- four years of this government. I've waited that long. I thought the First Minister would uphold the law before the election came and appoint a medical doctor as Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development. I'm not saying anything about it; I'm only here to uphold the law. And I as a member of the government for eleven years always did that job, even as a backbencher, uphold the law. That's why I'm still here after 15 years, Mr. First Minister, and I hope to be here a lot longer too -- (Interjection) -- yeah.

Mr. Chairman, I'm asking you a question now. Do the government want a medical doctor for a deputy minister? Are they wanting to divide, keep the doctors, medical doctors away from the government with no responsibility, no contact? I don't know what the reason is, but if I were the government of the day I'd want a medical doctor as deputy minister; I'd want him there.

Mr. Chairman, the same rule should apply, why should not a layman be Deputy Attorney-General? It's the same, but it doesn't happen that way. The Attorney-General is a lawyer, and his Deputy Minister. The Minister of Education has got an educationalist with a doctor as Deputy Minister of Education -- (Interjection) -- but yet what happens in Health and Social Development? The most important portfolio I guess in the whole -- with the exception of finance, I would consider finance more important because he rules the whole government -- but yet we have a layman as deputy minister. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture is a doctorate of agriculture, has a doctorate of agriculture -- (Interjection) -- he's a doctorate of agriculture. -- (Interjection) -- and he's Dr. Murray Cormack, and I know him well. -- (Interjections) -- There's nothing wrong with that, all that I'm saying that the government should uphold the law of the land, uphold the law of the land. In that way they can show the people of the Province of Manitoba that they deserve the attention that they deserve. But when the government, Mr. Chairman, when the government breaks the law, and do it year after year -- I think it's three and a half years since they appointed the first layman as deputy minister -- they don't deserve the vote of the people when it comes on June 28th, and I don't suppose they will.

Never in the history of the Province of Manitoba have an association like the Manitoba Medical Association been given the treatment that they have had, and I don't think that they deserve that treatment, and I only hope that the government take a complete reversal and will treat these men - because we need these men in our rural areas, let's not chase them away.

And the average age of doctors, Mr. Chairman, is about the same age as the average age of farmers -- and I happen to be on that target age, and it's in the middle fifties, and they're getting older, they're getting older, and I tell you we don't need any less doctors, we need as many or more in the future, but if they don't get a little better treatment from the government of the day than what they've got in the last couple or three years, we're going to have less doctors in our province than we had before. And I especially mention all the doctors here who are specialists, they're the ones that are -- and also I shouldn't mention them maybe, but the general practitioners have a large part to play too in the rural areas. But let's not lose doctors because of the lack of an appointment of a medical doctor as deputy minister in the Province of Manitoba.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Now I got a couple of other things I want to bring up, and one's Ninette Sanatorium. And I would be remiss I think if I didn't speak on this because -- I think I spoke on it about two or three times during this session. But that great institution out there, Ninette Sanatorium, millions of dollars of buildings, nothing being done, no leadership from the government, nothing. They sent out two civil servants to tell the people that they won't do anything and just about got their heads tore off because of it. This is not the kind of leadership, Mr. Chairman, that we deserve in the Town of Ninette, the constituency of Souris-Killarney. We want leadership from this Minister; we want him to come out and talk to us. We're not selfish people, we're only looking for the right thing at the right time; we want something to be done anyway.

The Town of Ninette is surely hit hard - half a million dollar payroll down to nothing - I think there are ten people working there now at the present time. And I'm only asking for leadership on behalf of the Minister, the First Minister and his Minister of Health and Social Development on this very important problem. Surely something can be done. My goodness the government are building buildings all over the Province of Manitoba -- high rise, senior citizens' homes, other types of low cost housing across this province. Surely something could be done in the Town of Ninette to kind of supplement the loss of the Sanatorium in that particular area.

One other thing that bothers me is a certain given man under the Associate Deputy Minister who has as much power as any man in government today, Dr. Tulchinsky, who is going around to the various areas of the province and telling them in no uncertain terms before any discussions take place with the Minister, or the Health Service Commission, how many beds communities will get in their area, and they can take it or else, take it or else; no discussions with the Minister or the Health Services Commission. Now I want to know what kind of power this man has. Where does he fit into the operations of the Department of Health and Social Development? Did you give him as much power that he can make any decision regarding new hospitals, personal care homes, or extended treatment hospitals? Does he have the power to go to these communities and tell them how many beds they will get, when they will get it, what colour it's going to be painted, and everything about this particular building? Because this is the kind of power I'm told that he has, and I want to know if you've given him this power. He's a pretty influential man, I'm told - I've never met the man - but I don't like giving a civil servant that kind of power without any recourse or any debate with the Minister on a new hospital, because I think it's important that these people have debate, or discussions anyway, with the Minister on a hospital because most communities only build about one hospital during a person's lifetime, and I think it should be well planned and documented before final discussions take place.

There's one thing that I was glad to see in my area, was the changes in boundaries in the social welfare districts, part of my area was in Portage district, part of it in Brandon before, now it's all transferred over to Brandon, and I think that this will be a great help for the people around Glenboro and Strathcona Municipality and also Turtle Mountain Municipality.

So with those few words, Mr. Chairman, I'll sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that someone else would go ahead of me yet, I wasn't quite ready. But I certainly would like to make some comments under the Minister's salary when we deal with Health and Social Services. After all this is the largest department of government. It's very close to that of Education and this represents - what is it, about 30 percent of the total budget for the government, and I think it's incumbent on all members to scrutinize the Estimates of the Department before us to see that the money is properly spent and that people in the province get value for the money.

On past occasions I've asked for a Standing Committee on this particular department so that we could call the people on the Health Services Commission or those boards before the Commission so that we could hear from them personally on the needs and on the various programs that are being operated under this department.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is very essential that such a committee be set up for the purpose in the Department of Education and also in that of Health. Because how are we to know whether a government is meeting its obligations, whether it is meeting the requests that are being made, or whether there are large requests that are going unheeded or unimplemented.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd) The Minister is very busy out there so I don't know whether he is listening or not. -- (Interjection) -- Well I was wondering whether there are large requests made by such bodies as the Hospital Services Commission, or other bodies within his department, of requirements that are not met. And we have no way of knowing. If we had a committee, a Standing Committee of the House, we could call these people before the committee so that we could hear from them ourselves on these various matters. Because we have such bodies as the Health Services Commission; we have the doctors under the Medicare Program. Certainly I would like to hear from them as to what they have to say, and why, if they are happy or are unhappy about the program and so on. Certainly when they're asking for more money they must be advancing reasons for it, and we have heard nothing of the kind from the Minister, why their fees should be increased. Are there logical reasons back of their requests, or their demands, for higher pay for their services? Do we have sufficient doctors in this province to meet the demands put on them by the people? We don't hear from the Minister on these points whether the service is rendered that is requested.

We spend a large amount of money for this type of service. I think it's something like 70, or the Hospital Services Commission is spending \$70-1/2 million, and the same the figure is not increased that much over the previous year. The Premier mentions some of that is spent in Altona and some of it is spent in Winkler, and I am sure that the doctors at the Winkler Hospital are very good doctors; we have an excellent staff there. Dr. Jacob and Dr. Khan and Wiebe, and Hoepfner is there now too. Dr. Jacobs is performing surgery that is performed nowhere else except in one place in Winnipeg, and so that we have top surgeons right in our own hospital. -- (Interjection) -- No, and I am very happy in our particular area on the services that we get. So we have no quarrel in that respect. But when they're asking for more money, are they justified in asking it? This is what I'd like to know. We have no way of discussing as members of this House, discussing these matters with the medical people. -- (Interjection) -- I accept - we discuss with them privately and I think the opportunity should be presented when we are spending this amount of money, we should have, as members have that right to examine this particular account and ask them personally in committee on the various aspects of the services that are being given and the payment thereof.

I notice from the report that we have from the Hospital Commission that the per bed costs have gone up something like 12.6 percent over the previous year. The cost was \$14,837 per bed in '71, that has risen to 16,703. This is a very substantial increase in one year and if we go at that rate certainly more money will have to be found, and I don't know whether we can always depend on the Federal Government to bail us out in increased funds. And I would like to know from the Minister on the budgets that have been presented this year, what is the increase going to be for this year, and for the year that has just passed, and for the present year that we are just encountering now? He no doubt will have the budgets by this time and are they making cuts when these budgets are being presented to the department? We never hear about this. I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on this.

Then too when you look at the Capital Estimates for this year, there's nothing in there for hospital construction. Are we no longer constructing any hospitals whatever? If we are then, how much is there in unused authorizations that we have unexpended to date? Certainly this is an area that I would like to know because since there's nothing on the sheet here for Capital, they must certainly have a large amount yet unused, and if so why was it not used, or did they at the time that they called for capital that it was over a period of certain years.

Then I note under Capital that we have an item of General Purposes of \$24 million. Is any of that 24 million going to construction of hospitals or these care homes? Certainly I get the feeling that we are probably hiding something in that 24 million. You can hide a lot of things in a 24 million item. So the -- (Interjection) -- Minister says it's in the Budget of the general, General Health Services. I can't find it for the moment. I'll certainly take a look at it in-between, so that it will give the Minister an opportunity to answer the questions.

If we had a committee we could also hear from the administrative people of the various hospitals, and also from the nursing staff. How is the program of a two-year nurses training course working out? From the experience that has been related to me by some other professional people in the field, is that they certainly are not performing the type of work that the nurses used to under the three-year course. And that they haven't had nearly the practical experience that they had before and therefore a lot of training has to go on during the early

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd) years of their employment at the local hospitals, so that I feel that differentiation should be made when these new nurses go out to work. I think there should be a difference in the pay schedule from that of other nurses who've been on staff for a longer period of time and who have probably had the three year course. Surely enough they've spent more time and money on their course, on the course at the time that they took it, and these people have been only training for two years and now are supposed to be at the same level and they just aren't from the experience and the information that I have.

The matter of the mentally ill. We have an item in the Budget of 10 million for that. I certainly at this time want to compliment the people of the Eden Mental Health Centre, and the government, in providing the necessary staff for it. I think the institution is performing a very good work and certainly a lot of people have been helped. It used to be in years gone by that when people suffered mentally that they were looked upon as an inferior type of people and if they had this type of disease. Now we find that people can go there and they get treatment, and they come out and they are just as normal as any other person. And I feel that this is a tremendous step forward that was made at the time that institutions of this type were brought in and are now performing very valuable service.

The Member for Assiniboia brought in the matter of denticare. As the Minister has stated the Commission has been appointed and I, too, feel that here is an area where a lot of potential exists as far as service is concerned. Many of our young people today don't get the service, get any service whatever, many children attending our schools today don't get any attention as far as dental work. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Assiniboia says, 70 per cent, and I wouldn't be one bit surprised if that isn't correct because too few, we have in the first place not the required number of dentists to do all the work. Secondly, it is too costly, and for people that work in rural areas at the pay they receive, they can't afford to pay for those kind of services at the expense that it calls for today. And I certainly would appreciate some kind of a form of assistance in this way. I feel as the Minister stated, or as has been said, we should start with the children of school age or from - during the time that they attend school especially. And I have no ideas at the present time of what the cost could involve, or how much would be involved, in such a program. Maybe the Minister can indicate, to give us some idea as to what such a program would cost. No doubt they must have made some surveys before and must have an idea as to how much is spent for dental services in the province today so that some judgment or some assessment can be made no doubt as to what a program of this type might cost.

The Welfare program is one that I think concerns us all. We have the various agencies and programs such as Workmen's Compensation and pension plans instituted some years ago, so that I think these various programs now come into the picture so that the cost, the overall cost of social services could well be reduced.

At one time we were told, and there were reports in the papers, especially in the Greater Winnipeg area, that we had four generations of welfare cases and that this was a continuing thing in certain families. Is that still the case and what is the record as far as the social service, social allowances and welfare costs in Manitoba? -- (Interjection) -- Well, this is what, this is what an account in the paper indicated at one time not too long ago, a few years ago. So it needn't involve 100 years for that matter. -- (Interjection) -- Could be that. I think because so many people today are on social services that many politicians don't dare talk about it. They don't want to come out in the open on it and criticize anything in this type of program for fear that they might lose some votes in the next election. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes, you might want to soft pedal it, but I am sure this is the case and that they're soft pedaling it now. They don't want to hurt, and especially in a year like this when an election might be called, that they might offend some people and as a result might not get a certain vote. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SCHREYER: . . . permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Member for Rhineland if he would agree to appear on the platform with me in his constituency say at - oh either at Schanzenfeld or Blumenort to speak on welfare and the work ethic. Would he agree?

MR. FROESE: Yes, I would. I might indicate at that time that certain people should receive more. In fact, because I know of certain cases where they've cut them down very badly, that need it for food and clothing, and whereas others are getting it more than they need. I think

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd) this is where our problem is today. We have many cases that are really in need and not getting what they deserve, or should have, yet others get away - and I don't know for what reason the social people the social workers will not deal with them equally, that there is certain preference shown in certain cases - - and I could bring cases before this body for that matter if need be to prove that very case. But I haven't got it here now but -- (Interjection) -- And I have visited these people and I know of their circumstances. I will conclude my remarks with that. The Honourable Minister would like to get in a few minutes yet. I'll have another time to make some further remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Rhineland for allowing me five minutes to at least answer a few questions that were posed this evening.

A MEMBER: First was the Member for Souris.

MR. TOUPIN: Well I would like to start with the Member for Souris-Lansdowne and indicate to him -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, Souris-Killarney, that the Deputy Minister has not been appointed Deputy Minister of Health. Hans Schneider who is my Deputy has been appointed Deputy Minister in the Department of Health and Social Development. And according to legal counsel, they advised that the appointment is perfectly legal under existing law.

I would like to inform the honourable members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that one of my Assistant Deputy Ministers is a doctor and I have quite a few doctors within the department. And maybe to comfort a bit the honourable member, my Deputy Minister is quite qualified in economics and apart from that he is a former farmer, so that gives him a lot of credit.

I would like to deal briefly with the question of maybe day care and with the dental in-House committee that we have. I think these are two questions that are very urgent and should be dealt with. I'd like to inform the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that we met this evening, that is my colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities and myself and a few other members of Cabinet, with a group of day care individuals interested in the program that we are looking at, and I did point out to them this evening that it would -- I didn't mention a universal program; I said a day-care program available to all based on ability to pay. Now as far as the details in regards to the grants that will be made available to start these day-care facilities, and the per diem that will be set, this will be determined following the negotiations that are now under way with the Federal Government, and hopefully that we can conclude these negotiations very shortly and that I can inform the House of the details of the day care facilities that would be possible with funds that are available within my department.

The honourable member quoted a figure of a half a million dollars within my Estimates. As the member well knows, this is ten times as much as I had in my budget in 1972-73 and this will certainly allow us to go a long way into meeting at least the largest part of needs pertaining to day care facilities and services.

In regards to the -- (Interjection) -- I'll come back to that later. Unfortunately I haven't got enough time this evening to go into any finite details. Now as far as the Denticare program, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I felt he made a lot of good remarks and I'd like to deal with some of them later. But the in-House committee with which we're consulting not only dentists but we will be consulting with other groups within the dental profession itself, hopefully that they can come forward with a very specific recommendation for government to at least make some decision by, say, maybe August or September 1973. I wouldn't want to wait much longer than that and even sooner, for us to determine more clearly to the public of Manitoba what the government intent is pertaining to Denticare, at least for children, children in school.

It's not quite 9:00 o'clock; I believe I still have a minute and I have about four or five pages of questions that were posed by different members.

I'd like to maybe deal just for a minute, which I have, for the comments made by the Member for Rhineland, which was the last speaker this evening. He made remarks in regards to Eden in his own constituency and I must say that that facility is rendering good services and, as the honourable member is quite aware, we're looking at a different approach pertaining to corrections, which is another field of treatment for individuals, and I wouldn't mind sitting down with him and maybe some of his people to look at the outreach in regards to corrections. Since that facility was such a success in that area, maybe we could sit down and arrive at something that will be more satisfactory for the individuals that we have within our correctional institutions . . .

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, has directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. The first item is Bill No. 21, as amended by the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has six minutes. The Honourable Member is missing.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can we have this matter stand, unless if somebody else wishes to speak he may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Matter stand. Bill No. 34. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): In the absence of the Honourable Leader may this matter please stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. We are now on Private Members' resolutions. The resolution before the House is Resolution No. 5 -- (Interjection) -- Drops to the bottom, it does not stand. Resolution No. 7. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and amended by the Honourable Minister of Labour, the Honourable Member for Lakeside - 14 minutes left.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in the member's absence could we have the matter drop to the bottom of the list?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Resolution . . .

MR. GREEN: No, it has to be either voted upon or spoken to or debated. That's right. One or the other. Mr. Speaker, I think he's past . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Oh yes, that's right. We are - this one has already been introduced so therefore we must proceed with it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we appear to be going beyond two resolutions which would mean that the person who would have the third resolution, the Member for La Verendrye, would not have normally been expecting that it would come up this quickly. He's ready to proceed. Well, then we would have to deal, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that if the members wanted to call it 10:00 o'clock there would be no objection, but we have to proceed with a vote on No. 7 or speaking on No. 7.

MR. SPEAKER: We have No. 7 before us now. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to speak just briefly on this because I think there's one aspect of the argument that hasn't yet come forward and I think it's one that should be of interest to all those who have expressed an interest in environmental matters in regards to farm and recreational lands in Manitoba. Almost the entire argument here has revolved around feelings of nationalism and anti-feelings towards people outside Canada owning properties in Canada. But one of the things that hasn't been discussed is whether or not lands which may normally fall heir to uses which are not conducive to the development of the environment, that is the wildlife species that inhabit the environment, whether or not in fact lands that are being set aside for recreational purposes are perhaps enhanced by them being held by people for private recreational use. And I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we can deal adequately with the problem until the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management has looked at this aspect of the argument. I don't think any of us at this point are capable of answering the question as to whether or not a section of land or two sections of land or three or a block of land, which are purchased and held for the purposes of recreation, are not perhaps better

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) off than if they were put use to other purposes which may inhibit the use of that land by wildlife which would inhabit it if it was left in its natural state.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think basically that we are not in a position as a Legislature, as members of the Legislature, to be able to judge until we have some case samples following examination by the Department of the Environment, to be able to advise us whether in certain cases where this has happened whether the environment has benefitted or not, an attempt to divorce it, Mr. Speaker, from the strictly national, nationalistic anti-American arguments, if you like, that seem to predominate on this resolution. So I think that -- I don't know how the government intends to vote on this. I presume that they are voting against it from their remarks that have been made, but I think that even if that is the case, if the motion does not succeed, then it would be valuable if the Department of Environment could examine some samples of lands that are now held for this purpose in the Province of Manitoba, and examine them from the point of view of how the wildlife count exists in there compared to lands which may be adjacent to it which should have the same sort of inhabitation by natural wildlife species.

So I would like to see the argument put more on a biological basis because really, when you get down to it, most of the arguments we mount in this House are directed at people and what people should do and don't do, and what people do that we don't like them doing, whether they should do it or not on a biological basis, but I think that it would be valuable if we could look at this problem from the point of view of having heard so much on the environmental issues surrounding the northern hydro power development, South Indian Lake, archaeological studies. We're spending millions of dollars and probably spending millions of dollars mainly, primarily, because it's a political issue, when in fact we've got thousands of acres of land, agricultural land, that is falling under the jurisdiction of a resolution such as this, and we're not examining it in any way, shape or form. So if we can take lands that are included in this resolution, specifically for recreational purposes, and have the good Minister's department look at it, because they do have people in the department that have at least the professional expertise to examine it, and let this be a case study for us to determine whether these lands are more productive or less productive from an environmental point of view, than they would be if they were allowed to go for other purposes, Crown lands which may be leased out for haying or leased out for grazing, leased out for cultivation, broken up for purposes of agriculture.

Let them tell us before we judge this strictly on the basis of whether we don't like Americans owning it or not, whether or not in the interests of North America, Canada and other parts of North America, whether or not there is a biological reason as opposed to a nationalistic argument, why these lands should be or should not be kept aside from outside ownership simply on the basis that we don't like certain people owning them. Let them tell us whether a specific section of land or block of land in a township is more productive or less productive and less enhancing to the wildlife and other biological aspects than a similar block of land which is in the next township or next door to it that is put to other purposes, where we take an economic return from it for our own local interest but forget that we're attempting to force out foreigners, if you like, by mounting an environmental argument which we really don't know very much about.

So, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that, whether this resolution passes or otherwise, I think that the department, if it can mount the manpower to do it, would be doing the Province of Manitoba a favour by doing some case studies on these recreational lands to see whether they're shot out in the fall or whenever it might be, whether or not they are not in fact beneficial to the environment in total, and with those few words, Mr. Speaker, which I have been harbouring but found the occasion now when I was prepared to adjourn this speech, I'll let that be my contribution.

RESOLUTION 7.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Riel I think has put his finger correctly on the pulse and the whole essence of the argument that is now before us with respect to the resolution introduced by the Leader of the Liberal Party. And although I am inclined to agree that the resolution was perhaps introduced somewhat in the hope of mounting some anti-American sentiment, and perhaps there may be some remote justification for that, I'd like to deal with it in somewhat the same way the Member for Riel has dealt with the recreational aspect. I'd like to deal with the farmland aspect which is also included as a part of the resolution. And I, although I have some sympathy with anyone who proposes an argument that would start to take a very serious look at the need to preserve farmland in this country, we are having growing evidence of the need to produce more and more food. We're having growing evidence of the failure of the so-called green revolution, which several years ago seemed to hold up so much hope for the world being able to feed itself. We're having more and more evidence of a return to a situation that we experienced in the Thirties, and certainly this spring is one of those years when we begin to wonder if there's going to be a possibility of producing from the soil that which will be required in order to feed the population of this country. So you can have some sympathy for the need to ensure that acres of valuable farmland which are now being gobbled up by the encroachment of cities and asphalt, I believe that unless we very soon take some steps to ensure that good farmland — and there's not that much of it left in the country — is reserved for the purpose of producing food.

I have some reservations about the suggestion that somebody in the departmental level can make that determination. I have some reservation about some expert classifying soils saying this is good for that purpose and something else is good for that purpose, because my experience has been, over the years, that the best use of farmland is determined by a person who owns the land and it has been with some amazement that I have watched people who have taken control or assumed control and ownership of Crown land that was considered useless, and suddenly because they understand the soil, and suddenly because they know how to use it and manage it, suddenly that soil becomes productive. Such an experience one could find in the area of Steinbach, the area that my friend from La Verendrye is from, where in the eastern areas of Steinbach one found that soil had been considered submarginal and unfit for agricultural production, but when people who knew how to manage soil took it over, and I don't want to make a predetermination of whether or not that be a Canadian or an American or anybody else, when somebody knew how to manage soil and understood soil, what it would produce, its capabilities, and then began to plan his production program intelligently, we found that we could produce food from soil that hitherto had been considered incapable of producing food.

So I hesitate to suggest, as my honourable friend from Riel has, I think, implied, that an analysis of that kind of soil be made to determine whether or not it can be used for productive uses or not, I think that will depend largely on the person that owns that land. And I think that the resolution in itself is somewhat negative in that it's simply asking that we prevent somebody else from doing something so that we can do it ourselves and we're not entirely sure that we're the best ones that can do it. In the final analysis the resolution does boil itself down to a question of civil rights in one respect, because I happen to own a few acres of land and I don't want the government or anybody telling me who I could sell it to, and if I feel that I can sell land profitably for myself, then I want to be able to make that determination since I own it.

-- (Interjection) -- Well, I think my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside pointed that out very well when he made his remarks on that particular subject, and there's no question that if you take this particular resolution and stack it up alongside the Bill of Rights, as proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party, one finds some considerable conflict, and I would think that if I was in his boots I'd have some difficulty in reconciling the two opposing views that are expressed in this resolution as opposed to the Bill of Rights that he has proposed.

But I simply rise to point out that in determining the proper use of land, it goes much beyond what can be determined by a group of so-called experts, and I have always had some suspicion of soil experts with the experience that I have had in agriculture, because, as I said earlier, I had discovered that proper management techniques, proper understanding of soil capabilities and the proper utilization of soil, can produce from the soil that which hitherto

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) had been unexpected, and there's no better evidence of that, as my honourable friend from La Verendrye will indicate, than the people who live in the same back area who, because of their desire to remain as a community, have expanded beyond the original boundaries of that community, and they've taken over soil that had been considered useless, had been considered submarginal, and where other people had left, because they understood the soil, because they knew its capabilities, because they nurtured it and because they didn't attempt to grow that which was not possible of growing on that soil, they made a success of farming.

And that is the story throughout this entire country, Sir, that where people understand the soil, where people live with the soil, they're capable of putting it to use, they're capable of feeding a hungry world. And we're going to find that as we continue to require more and more food to feed the ever-increasing population of this world, the kind of land that is required is the very kind of land that is being gobbled up by cities. We have that experience here right in the City of Winnipeg, and I am an advocate of some limitations on the size to which our cities should grow -- not only because of the difficulties that are posed by the expenses of providing the services that are required within an unlimited boundary, but because of the fact that it is using up some of the best farmlands that are required to produce food. I, for example, can't understand why the Whiteshell area, which isn't an area that can produce food in abundance, cannot be used as a city with fast communication services between that Whiteshell area and the City of Winnipeg, so that people can live in that area and have the advantages of winter and summer and the beauties of living in that kind of a district as opposed to the crowded atmosphere of the city, and yet have as their place of business the City of Winnipeg itself.

There are communities throughout this entire province that are set aside for urban development and set aside for community development that aren't being utilized. We hear the First Minister and we hear the government keep talking about their desire to encourage the development of rural areas, but I don't see any great evidence of any concrete measures that are being proposed in order to encourage them; as a matter of fact, the resolution, or the bill that I have on the Order Paper that has been stood now for half a dozen times by the Member for St. Matthews, is an indication of the kind of attitude that we see on the part of the government, because what I am attempting to do in this particular resolution is to encourage one little fellow develop an industry in a rural area, and I would have thought that this government would have jumped at that opportunity, would have applauded that opportunity, and would have passed it, to ensure that this fellow who has not asked a cent from the taxpayers of this province, who hasn't encroached upon the public treasury at all, all he asks for is an opportunity to sell something that he's manufacturing. I think, Sir, that if we're to encourage the development of the rural community, here is one area in which that can be done. I don't see any evidence on the part of this government that they're prepared to do that, and I've been waiting patiently for the government to take some procedural steps . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the House Leader has now received . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Point of order has been raised. Would the honourable member state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting patiently and I agree, I can understand my honourable friend's impatience, but nevertheless he'll have to endure his impatience and he'll have to get back to the subject, which he knows full well he has strayed from.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The subject, of course, Sir, is the sale of recreational and farmland to outsiders, and I can tell my honourable friend the House Leader if he wants to relate my remarks to that subject, that's exactly what's going to happen if they don't do something about rural development, and so it was on that context that I was making the few remarks that I intended to make on this particular subject, and I hope that the government will see fit to follow the suggestion that is contained in the bill that I have proposed as one way in which that can be encouraged. But I want to reiterate again, Sir, that the question of the proper use of farm and recreational land is one that is going to be forced upon us in increasingly large doses, because I think it is one that has to be considered. But I hope, I hope, Sir, that in giving consideration to this subject that we don't overlook some of the very basic things -- civil liberties is one of

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) them, and there is a great conflict between this resolution and the Bill of Rights and the right of the individual to dispose of his property the way he chooses, and I think that before we pass this resolution we want to look very seriously at that particular aspect of it. I am not, I am not in any way attempting to criticize the intent of this resolution, the need for something to be done; at the same time, I think that I would be inclined to oppose it at this stage by virtue of the fact that it is so much in conflict -- (Interjection) -- with the desires of -- I haven't even looked at the amendment -- (Interjection) -- with the desires of the people of this country because I think that first and foremost as a government or as a legislative body we have a responsibility to ensure that civil liberties are not interfered with.

I cannot quarrel with the amendment, because I think the amendment pretty much embodies the suggestions that I have been making in the last few minutes. Sir, with those remarks, I'll let the debate continue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't very much that I'd like to say in connection with this resolution but the thing that does . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. HENDERSON: . . . that I do notice in here is "consider the advisability of" and I've seen these resolutions before -- and somebody said, well there's no harm in passing a resolution like that, it don't amount to anything; it's only considering the advisability of, and a few people voted that way on a previous occasion and were sorry for it later on. I don't want to be caught in that trap. That last part sounds very good but "considering the advisability of."

But in this here resolution, it's not only talking about Crown lands, it's talking about farm lands. I feel quite differently about Crown lands that the Crown owns and is looking after, but when it says farm lands, which means that one farmer can't sell to another farmer, or whether he's in the United States, when you set up those type of values and that, I'm very much against it, and I think that just like we can go across there and buy a piece of land and if we want move over there later on, I think that the same privilege should be afforded Americans on this side.

Now I know it's not politically popular to talk about letting the people from the United States come here and buy land or other things and they say they're going to run our industries and our corporations and everything, but I think we're just going overboard when we say that they can't even come up here and buy farm lands and maybe even with the intentions of establishing residences. So I think this resolution is not any good. In fact even though you've got "advisability" up in there and got that last paragraph, I'm against the whole resolution and I intend to vote against it.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've listened to the Member for Morris and I've listened to my friend the Member for Pembina, I've listened to others in this debate dealing with the resolution and the amendment that has been proposed by the Minister of Agriculture, and I believe I can understand the sentiments that were expressed of the Member for Portage when he originally introduced the resolution. It's an anti-American type of resolution, but it was introduced, I think, because there was some specific resentment to a particular situation that occurred dealing with the operations of a tract of land. But I would ask my honourable friends to also remember some of the specific actions of other groups of Americans dealing with specific tracts of land in the Province of Manitoba and the work that has been done by Ducks Unlimited in this country, not only in Manitoba but in other provinces throughout the Dominion, and I think that every member in this Legislature would applaud that type of work. So I can't see where we should be considering legislation which specifically excludes our friends from across the border from activities such as Ducks Unlimited have carried out in this province. -- (Interjection) -- Well the teachers are usually in Crown-owned property so that there isn't that same distinction there; they're usually working in schools which are owned by the Crown.

However, we have another view that's been expressed here by the Minister of Agriculture, who wants to preserve the land in the Province of Manitoba for the recreational purposes, to be used for the most beneficial use by Manitobans. We have the Minister of Tourism who just completed his estimates here, who is inviting people from other parts of Canada, indeed from

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)the Americans and other parts of the world, to come and visit Canada to make use of our recreational facilities, and here we find the Minister of Agriculture is wanting us to preserve the lands in Manitoba for the most beneficial use by Manitobans.

Now I don't think that when the Minister was making that amendment that he really considered the full impact of that, and I honestly believe that there is maybe a halfway medium course here that the Minister would probably like to take. There is in this country a growing sense of nationalism and a growing anti-American feeling -- (Interjection) -- where people are somewhat concerned about American ownership in Canada. And I think the Minister of Agriculture would be quite agreeable if he had used the words "for the most beneficial use of Canadians." I think he would have agreed to that.

There are many kinds of Canadians in this country as evidenced by the Member for Flin Flon -- (Interjections) -- Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the Minister of Agriculture would be in the House tonight because I am sure he would agree with me that probably the word "Canadians" instead of "Manitobans" would be most acceptable to all members of this House, and while I would hesitate to make that amendment to the amendment I think that probably in the interest of hitting a sort of a halfway middle of the road course, I think that it might be more acceptable to all concerned, and I would suggest to members of the government very strongly they consider making that type of change in the wording of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland,

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, again I wasn't quite ready because I was going to make an amendment to this motion, or to the amendment. The amendment the way I see it lends itself to various interpretations, and what I read into this is that lands in Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use by Manitobans would indicate, if this government interpreted it, it would then mean that the lands should be owned by the Crown, because what they have cut out of the Resolved part is that the land be owned by Canadians or people living in Canada. And I think this is very important that they cut this particular thing out, because to me it's important that people in Manitoba own the property and not by way of the Crown but individual ownership. I think many people as far as land for recreational purposes, probably don't object to it being Crown land, but as far as farming is concerned, and farm land is mentioned here too, that farm land certainly in my opinion should be owned by farmers themselves. Because once you have the Crown own all the farm land, you just have workers; you no longer have owner-operators. And we know what happens if that is the case from Europe. Just look at Russia, where the land is owned by the Crown and where the Crown determines what will be seeded, how the land will be operated, and we find that the bulk of the land, which is Crown-owned, produces very little, that the small portion that is owned by the people themselves produces more . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. FROESE: . . . large acreages that are owned by the Crown. And this is what we are doing by amending this resolution by the Agricultural Minister's amendment. And I can't support that the way it reads now and I didn't get the time to prepare my amendment, so that I could amend it in such a way that it would read that way so that -- (Interjection) -- so that lands would not revert to the Crown necessarily but that farmers would be entitled to own it.

We are talking here now of recreation and farm lands. What about minerals? And I would like -- the Member for Portage isn't here. What about minerals? Land where we have the minerals which is being used by these large companies, and probably for the most part American-owned companies. So I think this is just as important an item or probably more important than what we're discussing in the resolution here as far as recreation is concerned. So that the way the amendment reads, I hesitate to give it my support. While on the surface it reads and seems as though it is unharmed, there is nothing wrong with it, that Manitobans be protected, or that lands in Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use by Manitobans. Certainly on the surface it seems very good and that we should all support it. But the underlying reasoning behind it, this is what scares me off and which I -- if it just applied to recreation I wouldn't mind, but when it applies to farm lands as well.

And I notice here from the fifth "Whereas", "And Whereas the farmlands within the province are a vitally important ingredient in Canadian national interests and, like our recreation lands, must remain Canadian owned." Again, I think it isn't completely necessary that all land be owned by Canadians. The Member for Pembina made mention of this. I certainly

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. FROESE cont'd) wouldn't take exception if some of the people bought some land up here and if it was worth the advantage, the same if we went out there and bought some acreage out there. I certainly wouldn't want to deny the sale of -- denying them the right to purchase even small amounts of property here. Certainly we wouldn't want to do that, at least I wouldn't and I don't think other members would want to do that. But at the same time, we certainly don't want to subscribe to that we will only have -- that all our farm land and recreational land be Crown-owned. So, I know I have now exhausted my right to speak on the amendment and therefore will not be able to amend the motion. Maybe I can draw an amendment up and have someone else make the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thought that we were going to be calling it 10:00 o'clock about ten after nine but I can see that we're going to probably exhaust our time on this resolution which has taken a rather interesting turn of events because the Member for Morris got up and made a very good and interesting presentation and indicated a, well a negative attitude towards the resolution but looked at the amendment and on immediate glance could see that what the amendment said was that there be a consideration as to how lands in Manitoba can be best used for the benefit of Manitobans. And even the Member for Morris, who I think is a pretty fair watchdog and doesn't like to see, you know, see sinister socialist plots slip by him, saw this as a rather harmless resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, to outdo the cynicism of the Member for Morris we had the Member for Rhineland getting up and making a speech, Mr. Speaker, which identified this resolution as being a desire of the Minister of Agriculture to have all Crown lands, have all land in Manitoba owned by the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rhineland, if I was to say to the Member for Rhineland that it is now the third period of the hockey game and we should, the two of us, go out and walk down the hall, find a television set and watch the hockey game, the Member for Rhineland would say, "That is a Bolshevik plot." Mr. Speaker, that is a demonstration of the Member for Rhineland's thinking with regard to this resolution. And he says that a statement that Manitobans should figure out a way to use their land for the benefit of Manitobans is a Bolshevik plot to have all Manitoba land owned by the Crown. And he then goes on to say that it has to be owned by the farmer. And of course, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem which has historically been a situation which has created a great deal of difficulty and I'm not saying that there shouldn't be land in Manitoba which is, which gives . . .

MR. FROESE: . . . the benefit of the honourable member speaking . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member have a point of order?

MR. FROESE: The score is five to one for Chicago.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know what procedure that would be.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I recognize my honourable friend's telling me the score as being a Capitalist plot. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate that the ownership of land has always been a problem and how you deal with it publicly or privately has never been solved by anybody, that presumably if you have a million people in the Province of Manitoba today and there are a certain number of arable acres and they were divided up equitably amongst all of the people of Manitoba not in their composite, and I'm not talking about all of the people, let's take all of the people who want to till it, to cultivate it, that they would get a certain amount of land, and if that number doubled in 25 years and the Honourable Member for Rhineland still believed that land should be divided I suppose fairly amongst the farmers, and if we took fairly, as near equal as possible, then they would each own half as much land. And if that doubled again in another 25 years, they would again own half as much land. And if what I'm describing sounds like some *reductio ad absurdum*, let me say that that has been a problem in European countries. That was the problem in France when the land had to be divided by a family to the sons, and then from the sons again to their sons. Well, and many other countries, and if the honourable member would go to the Province of Quebec and see the narrow strips of land on which they farm, he will see that that process took place, and that the notion that sort of the province as a whole owning land -- and by the way, we have struck a balance which I think most members accept. We have said the Crown will not sell any more land. And I haven't heard much reaction from the Honourable Member for Rhineland, which would indicate that the public owning the land and trying to utilize it so that Manitobans living here get the best benefit, hasn't been completely that detestable to him because he really hasn't attacked us

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. GREEN cont'd) for this policy, not has anybody really. I don't think that the Conservative caucus has attacked us. Even the Liberal position, which I find very peculiar, they haven't really attacked us for not selling what we now own as a public. So that the concept of public ownership of land so that it can then be used by Manitobans in such a way as to get the best benefit for all Manitobans, isn't entirely apparently reprehensible as far as the honourable member is concerned, because that has not come under attack.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the problem with public ownership of land is that unless the person cultivating the property feels that the improvements and the husbandry which is exercised by him has some tenure, then it is possible that he will not put his efforts into that land. This has been again recognized for many many years. The physiocrats in France recognized it and they tried to do things about dealing with the tenure of land and, you know, we talk about public ownership on land, Torrens Title, which is supposed to be private ownership which is not really private ownership, because Torrens Title merely means that unless the state comes and takes it back, which they always have the right to do, it stays with the individual, but every state has the right to say that that land ultimately belongs to the state and we are forcibly going to take it and you're going to be compensated. How much different is a Torrens Title from a 99 year lease, which is technically ownership in the Crown but which gives so much tenure as to allow the person who cultivates the land to recognize that the improvements that he puts in will be realized by himself, or an intermediate . . .

And all of these things are problems and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, that the debate doesn't come down as simple as he and Mr. Bennett and other people have put it, that this is an argument between free enterprise and socialism or, as the Honourable Member for Rhineland would have it, that the Minister is seeking to confiscate Manitoba lands. That's not what's happening at all. But if the honourable member suggests that public ownership of land is somehow a Bolshevik plot, would he be surprised if the concept comes not at all from the Communist manifesto, but it comes from something which I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland has great respect for and which is diametrically opposed to Bolshevism. The concept of public ownership of land really is found in the Old Testament which says, and I can't . . . I'm not an expert on it, the honourable member is more of an expert than I am, which says that on the Jubilee year there will be no longer private ownership of land. It has to revert back to the people, be divided equitably, and then kept for a certain number of years, not longer than 50. Am I right? Well the honourable member is nodding and I rely on him as an expert. That you couldn't own it, that you could not own it for more than 50 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member, reading the Bible, look at it and say, "This is a Bolshevik plot?" Because that's what it comes down to, Mr. Speaker. That is what it comes down to. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member would examine, for instance, the works of Henry George, who was not a socialist. And as a matter of fact, the Georgites consider themselves to be the direct opposites of the socialists.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Will the Minister permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Certainly.

MR. FROESE: On this matter of the Jubilee year that the land revert back to the people as a whole, does he also realize with that, under that same ruling there that the people were again allowed to purchase that land because within a short time the people, the individuals owned it again?

MR. GREEN: Oh I agree with that. I agree with that. I agree that after it reverted back to the public as a whole it was then parcelled out again to individuals but for no longer than 50 years. And at that Jubilee it belonged, not to any person, and that, Mr. Speaker, is less than the 99 year lease that I was talking about and is far less than the Torrens Title, which of course in the last analysis, the Torrens Title I suppose one could argue that it is tenancy at will because the public could take it back at any time, even though it stands as clear title the public can take it back, tenant in fee simple but the public — a tenant in fee simple, that's all it is — because the public can take it back at any time. But even under the concept of the Jubilee which is found, I repeat, not in the Communist manifesto but in the Old Testament, it became public property again because nobody, no person, no individual, no human being could co-op to himself what God had given to everybody. That correct? The honourable member nods his head. That is correct, that no individual -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes, okay.

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Mr. Speaker, now the honourable member is becoming the strongest Bolshevik because he says, he says that we should adopt that same policy that no private individual, no private individual should have the exclusive right for himself to what God has given to everybody; because although it is possible for an individual to create something by the joint efforts of himself and the resources that he finds, that is what is provided by God, and that can belong to him, what he creates by the efforts of himself and the resources that God has put at his disposal. It was conceived that nobody could say that this portion of the world's surface is mine as against all others; that was the concept, and the honourable member will find the same concept in the writings of Henry George on this subject. And therefore for him to identify that with the Minister of Agriculture seeking by a sinister plot to take Crown ownership of all land away from the people of Manitoba, is stretching his imagination, Mr. Speaker, farther than I think he even wants -- (Interjection) -- he says it would lend itself to that interpretation. Well, I think that the honourable member was speaking largely with tongue in cheek, it's sort of a nice night, there hasn't been cursed words passed across the floor, and I think maybe that he felt that tonight is a nice day to make a speech on that subject.

And I, Mr. Speaker, am not trying to be dogmatic one way or the other. I say that the concept of Torrens Title is a problem; the concept of a lengthy lease is a problem; the concept of Crown land owned collectively doesn't do the job, doesn't enable what is best for the benefit of Manitobans. What I am almost certain of -- and here I have to guard my words because I'm walking into murky waters and I have done this before -- is that the policy will not be a better policy if private ownership of land is restricted on the basis that a person is either a Winnipegger, a Manitoban, a Canadian, an American, or something else, that once it becomes private ownership as such in terms of tenure, that it really is not a serious problem as to which private person owns it. The public has to protect land for the people of Manitoba. If it permits a private person to own it, and it says that that person has to be a Manitoban, then I want to know what it does when that Manitoban owns a section of land in the Province of Manitoba and goes to the United States after he makes money and wants to get out of the cold weather, which some Manitobans do, does he then have to sell the piece of land that he owns in the Province of Manitoba; or should it be the case given the doctrine of reciprocity -- which is also found in the bible of which my honourable friend is an expert -- should it be the case that Manitobans should not be able to buy land in Florida or the Bahamas or North Dakota, is that -- (Interjection) -- or Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona, because I have some very good friends who own land in Phoenix, Arizona, and they are Manitobans. And I know that different governments will enact these type of laws, and I think that carried to its ultimate that it becomes greater and greater self-defeating. And I know, Mr. Speaker, -- and that's why I said I'm walking into murky waters -- that there is a notion that there should be an economic, national land policy, and some day I may find myself wrestling to have to modify and conform my ideas to such a policy, or at least accommodate myself to such a policy, which all of us in politics from time to time have to realize that our own particular thinking might not be the one that is adopted, and that we can't run off in all directions every time we don't get exactly what we want. And I would think that it is becoming the fashion across this country to talk in terms of such a policy. I would not be one who would think that that was a priority issue; I do think that it is a priority issue to protect the land for the public, and that's why the Manitoba government has not sold, with exceptions which are only mined Crown lands during the period of this administration.

Now having not sold Crown lands we haven't answered the problems, because how do I get the Member for Morris, or the Member for Birtle-Russell, or the Member for Virden, to produce food and to do the best job on a piece of land unless he knows that the efforts that he is putting in on his behalf are going to accrue to himself as a reward for those efforts, and therefore it is not the answer and we have to search for other answers. I'm really quite sort of cynical about the resolution that was put forward by the Member for Portage la Prairie, because I remember that there was a fuss about somebody not having the right to run on somebody's property to hunt, and thinking that he could make something out of this because it was an American whose property he couldn't hunt on, and immediately that this became the slightest bit of an issue, as has happened in every other case of this kind, the Leader of the Liberal Party rushes to the front of the line and when he sees a crowd walking down the street, and says, "Look, I am the leader and I am going to fight for the right of Canadians not to have to go and pay an American for the right to hunt on their property.

RESOLUTION 7.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is wrong for a Canadian or a Manitoba citizen to have to pay to go on somebody's property to hunt in recreation . . . , if that is wrong -- and I am not by any means convinced that it is wrong, and I've taken the opposite, that nobody can come on my property without my permission -- then why is it wrong that somebody is prevented from walking on the Member for Rhineland's property unless he obtains his permission. But if that is wrong, then it's wrong whether it's a Manitoban or an American or a Japanese, or anybody else, and therefore trying to stir up a nationalist fervour on this issue is an irresponsible thing, because one of the real problems with a democratic system, Mr. Speaker, and responsible government, is that when people in a position of political promise, trying to wave the flag for the purpose of gaining their arguments, that it is possible that they will succeed; and the one problem that I have always had with the democratic process is that it works fine until you get some demagogue who starts to use nationalism and that more crimes have been perpetrated in the name of nationalism than anything else that I can think of, and this is what some person who is in a weak position seizes on when he hasn't got a good argument; not if your argument is good, and if you can make a case for the position that you are putting, then you shouldn't have to wave a flag to make your case, it should be a good case no matter what the colour of the flag is. And that is what annoyed me about the Leader of the Liberal Party's resolution. But I want to urge my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland -- I guess I'm going to talk this out -- I want to urge my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, to confer with my friend the Member for Morris and satisfy himself that the resolution as worded now does at least focus the problem on what it is, even though it is not an answer, and that he should not consider it to be a Bolshevik . . . on behalf of my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture, who I assure him is a very conservative fellow, he's too conservative, and that he should go ahead and vote for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member's time is up. It is 10:00 o'clock. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)