

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 9, 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 loge on my right where we are pleased to have as our guest this afternoon the Honourable Mr. Eiling Kramer, Minister of Highways and Transportation for the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Kramer is visiting our Minister of Highways, the Honourable Mr. Burtniak, on his way to a meeting of the Roads and Transportation Association being held in Toronto. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

I should also like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 5 standing of the Cranberry Portage School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kostynyk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

And we also have 60 students of Grade 9 standing of the John Gunn Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hilderman and Mr. Ferman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour.

On behalf of all the honourable members 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.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, may I, on behalf of the Honourable the Minister of Highways, present a Return from an Order of the House No. 2, Manitoba Telephone System.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

STATEMENT

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave of the House to make a non-political statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

MR. ASPER: May I call on this Legislature to join me and the people of Winnipeg in extending the congratulations of this House to three students of Gordon Bell High School who have captured for the second consecutive year the national mathematics championship of Canada. This is not only a great distinction and honour to come to the constituency of Wolseley, but to the school itself which--and I suppose to the Department of Education of Manitoba which has allowed Gordon Bell to be used as an experimental school in many new types of study. To show how progressive and experimental that school is, the principal has in his office a picture of leading Canadian politicians of all three political parties, and one of the young students involved in capturing for the second consecutive year the award for Gordon Bell is none other than one Martin Green, who has a relative relationship with this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. So on behalf of all members, I have written to Gordon Bell, assuming that we would have concurrence in such a motion of congratulations, to extend the congratulations to the three students whose names are Bill Leslie, Martin Green and Matt Ellis. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to not necessarily correct the press, but yesterday you heard me say, I addressed the First Minister as a sneaky fellow. I really meant that in the very lightest of vein and I certainly didn't mean it in the intent many people who read the Winnipeg Free Press might have termed it as, because I respect my First Minister and I did it because it was on the spur of the moment; he did sneak in when I wasn't watching him; so in that term I leave it there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's explanation is easy to accept because I felt all along that he did mean it in a bantering manner. I myself have a very definite term of endearment which I use--term of affection which I use in relation to my honourable friend, but it's not even printable. Nevertheless it is a term of affection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I address this question to either the First Minister -- no, I'll change again -- I'm a bit of a switch hitter, I guess -- directly to the Minister of Highways. The highways program being well under way in my area and many others, when is he going--the question being, Sir: when is he going to announce the program? It's obvious we won't get to his Estimates, I would suggest. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Virden has been in the House long enough to know that when the Department of Highways' Estimates or any department's Estimates come up, and particularly this refers to the Highways Department, that when the Estimates come up at that time the highways program is distributed in the House.

MR. MCGREGOR: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. But these roads are being built. I'm being asked "is it?" And I say, "Well you look, the . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. MCGREGOR: ". . . contractors are there and the Minister hasn't announced it. I just say I think he should tamp the gun.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the honourable member is trying to put across but, as you know, from time to time, from year to year certain programs are announced and are not finished within that year. So there are certain programs that were announced last year and were not finished, are to be continued this year, and then again, for the honourable member's information, we have a \$12 million free advertising program which was announced a long time ago, and these may be some of the programs that he's talking about.

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

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question, I think, should be directed to the House Leader but in his absence to the acting House Leader. The question -- (Interjection) -- I haven't begun. The question, Mr. Speaker, is: when will the government introduce the new Civil Service Act that was referred to in the Speech from the Throne?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: The answer could be "soon", Mr. Speaker, but I want to tell my honourable friend I issued instructions to the legislative counsel to proceed with the bill today.

MR. ASPER: Because of the widespread interest, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister also indicate whether that bill will clearly permit leave of absence to be granted to Crown corporation employees and/or civil servants to participate in public affairs by running for office in Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure had my honourable friend been around for a few years instead of a few months, he would agree that it would be inappropriate for me to reveal the contents of a bill that has not reached consideration stage at this time.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister then at least give an indication or assurance to the House that the bill will be presented this session for debate and passage?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I was clear or not. I indicated to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that I have issued instructions for the proceedings in connection with the bill today, and hopefully it will be given every consideration at this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the announcement he has made known that he is investigating the prices of fertilizer, can the Minister indicate whether the Combines Investigation Branch of the Federal Government and seizing of the account books of all major Canadian fertilizer companies is going to materialize?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I'm led to believe that that is the case, but again, that's based on reportson the CBC network. I have

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. USKIW cont'd) not checked myself to find out whether that in fact is so. But if the news media is correct it would be the case.

The question of Manitoba's report is one which will be available fairly soon for the people of Manitoba to consider, hopefully, some time by the end of this month. But nevertheless it is not a time frame within which one could consider implications for the farm community at this point in time or for this year.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give somewhat of a summary answer to a number of questions put on the question of filling of dugouts and the pumping units that are available across the province to assist in particular our livestock producers. I want to report that we've had one pumping unit in operation in the northwest region of the province for a month in the Swan River and Minitonas area, presently in the Benito area. One pump has been operating in the western area of the province at Virden and it's presently at Hamiota. This pump has also been operating for approximately one month. One farmer-owned pump is operating with department-supplied pipe in Melita and has been operating for two weeks. One pump operated at the Starbuck area for a two week period as well. This particular one is a rental arrangement. The pumps are being allocated on the basis of need of the applicant and the distance required to move them. There is a charge of \$100.00 per dugout, and the rest, Mr. Speaker, is not important; it's technical detail.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his information on this topic. Can he indicate what is the maximum distance that those pumps will move water?

MR. USKIW: I may have that here, Mr. Speaker. I'll check through the technical part of it. No it doesn't give me those figures, Mr. Speaker. I don't have that answer handy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): I direct this question to the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker. I know that you received a brief from the people of Cranberry regarding some type of hospital facilities. Have you given this brief any consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I did receive a brief from some concerned citizens in Cranberry Portage in regards to health facilities and related social services, and the brief is being given consideration, and as far as the policy of this government pertaining to decentralization of staff, and addition in facilities to render service on a district basis.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer two questions asked of me by the Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party. And this is in regards to Concordia Hospital. The member asked, and actually my colleague the Minister of Labour may be as concerned, if not more concerned: does Concordia have a 30 percent vacancy? The answer is, in 1972 Concordia had a 74 percent occupancy rate.

The second question: does Concordia have 30 percent higher costs than other hospitals in Manitoba? The answer is no. The per diem at Concordia is \$53.90. At comparable hospitals such as Winkler and Selkirk, the per diem is \$49.20 and \$52.10 respectively.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate why Medicare is paying for abortions being performed in New York where they have abortions on demand and have had for a couple of years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding — and it's a firm understanding — is that the Health Services Commission in this province as in other provinces of Canada, pays for those therapeutic abortion procedures that are permitted under Canadian law, and if it is a procedure that is performed by a medical doctor extraterritorially to Canada, it must be in accordance with the same procedures criteria, and if there is some aspect of this that is known to my honourable friend that is different than what I have said, I hope he would bring it to our attention because that is not, it would not be the policy to allow for anything beyond that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister of Health's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . statements yesterday that they do pay . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me the same courtesy you allow others I will put the bloody question. In view of the Minister of Health's admission in this House that they are paying for abortions in New York based on New York doctors' decision and in view of the Premier's commitment a year and a half ago that New York abortions would not be paid for, would you mind telling us why . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I indicate to the honourable member that prefacing a question which is going to create a debate is not allowed. It's not allowed. Would the honourable member rephrase his question?

The Honourable Minister of Health state his matter of privilege.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I only wish the Honourable Member for Thompson would quote me accurately. If he waited at least to read what was said -- (Interjection) -- I'm on a point of privilege. The honourable member indicated a falsehood of what I said in the House yesterday, and that is my point of privilege. The honourable member quotes me as saying that I accepted pay for abortions performed in New York based on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . based on the regulations and the laws of New York, and that is completely false. What I said in the House yesterday was that we'd pay for any abortions performed in the world as long as they were according to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is offering an explanation, not a matter of privilege. Does the Honourable Member for Thompson wish to rephrase his question?

MR. BOROWSKI: I am rising on a point of privilege, if you don't mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. BOROWSKI: The Minister has accused me of falsehood and I am asking you to ask him to retract that statement, as you have forced us to retract on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: My interpretation of what was said was an explanation and a matter of opinion, not a statement of anyone stating something false. Therefore I don't believe that the matter of privilege exists. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has accused me of making a falsehood in this House and I ask for an apology and a retraction because I had to give one yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of privilege, I think it is necessary for you to determine, Sir, whether or not the Minister of Health indicated that the Member for Thompson's interpretation was a wrong interpretation or a false interpretation, which would be one matter, or whether he accused the honourable member of uttering a falsehood. In the latter case I would agree, Sir, that propriety of the House would require that that be retracted. The Honourable Member for Thompson would have an absolutely valid point of privilege. Unfortunately, Sir, as to whether the Honourable Minister of Health said that it was a false interpretation or a falsehood is not in my clear recollection, but one does demand an apology, the other one does not, and it is up to you, Sir, perhaps to get the record of Hansard in order to clear that up. The Honourable the Minister of Health perhaps could save us time if he did say that it was a falsehood to retract that, that that would be an impropriety.

MR. SPEAKER: I would concur with the Honourable First Minister. My recollection was that there was an explanation. Whether the statement was that it was a falsehood or a false interpretation I cannot recall. The Honourable Minister of Health maybe may explain.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the impressions left with the Honourable Member for Thompson in regard to my remarks yesterday can be proven by reading Hansard and that, Sir, you will decide by seeing Hansard yourself. I said that the Honourable Member for Thompson falsely represented my remark here today that I made yesterday in the House pertaining to abortions performed outside of Manitoba. And I still stand by that unless corrected by what is written in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): This is where our problems are developing day after day after day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BILTON: Surely the Minister will co-operate with you, Mr. Speaker. Why wouldn't he withdraw that remark? He's already -- (Interjection) -- and at the advice of the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. BILTON cont'd) First Minister. Surely he doesn't need any higher advice. In the interests of this House he has the responsibility and he should withdraw on behalf of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate all the contributions of all the honourable members but I believe--Order, please . . . but I believe we would probably proceed much more effectively if we had less prefacing which are the things that provoke the various discussions and debates. We are under the question period. Oral questions are allowed. I hope they will be direct and explicit. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the last time on a point of privilege. Obviously the Minister does not want to withdraw and you are not forcing him. I simply want to indicate to you that I do not intend to be guided by your double rulings in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. In view of his statement the other day that the grocery strike may be averted, can he report to the House if there is any progress being made in this area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to report that the participants in the dispute are meeting constantly. I have been in touch with some of them and they have indicated to me that they will continue their consultations one with the other, and also they are aware of the offer that I make as Minister of Labour, that if they feel that I should appoint a conciliation officer that they were prepared to accept it. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the parties will continue talking to one another and resolve their difference.

MR. PATRICK: I've a question for the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. I believe this question was taken as notice some time ago in his absence. I see the Minister in his seat. Can I ask him, was Mr. Gil Burrows, who was an NDP candidate in the last Federal Election, was he on salary while he was away from his duties and a candidate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary. Did he receive a consultant's fee for that period while he was away?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): We are still in the question period, Mr. Speaker? I direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the First--pardon me, to the Minister of Highways, when he gets through discussing with my colleague over there. Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of a--the question is in regard to provincial roads and it arises out of a press report this morning, and I read . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the honourable member is aware that we do not quote press reports. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I'll try a new approach, Mr. Speaker. As the press report indicates that the municipalities are either delighted with conditions of municipal roads or they are not in favour . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please? Question please. Would the honourable member place his question?

MR. WATT: I ask the Minister of Highways this question. Did he read and consider the resolution presented by the Rural Municipal Convention last fall which reads as follows:

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That's not necessary.

MR. WATT: May I not read from an official document?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. WATT: This is not a press report this is an official document.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Order, please. It is out of order.

MR. WATT: Then I simply ask the Minister -- (Interjection) -- is he still of the opinion that the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba are delighted, as he stated yesterday, with the conditions of provincial roads throughout the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, first of all I am not aware of any resolution; it certainly wasn't presented to me, and I don't know whether or not they are delighted or whatever, but

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BURTNIAC cont'd) I'm sure that they're quite happy.

MR. WATT: I'm prepared to table . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member ask a question? The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Last week he took as notice a question I put to him in regard to the Rolling River School Division and I wondered if he had an answer on the other school divisions that were appraised by his department, if any others were found to have been in receipt of an overpayment of per pupil grant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: At the time, Mr. Speaker, I've indicated, but none to my knowledge, and there still are none to my knowledge who received overpayment of grants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Privilege of the House.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. TOUPIN: I certainly offended the House by accusing a member of falsehood. I withdraw that statement. I only accuse a member of not interpreting my remarks correctly.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Education. This question pertains to the Frontier Collegiate School. It's a conservative school and of course allowed students on the fence. Are there any chance of getting that fence removed, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've no intention of sitting on the Frontier Collegiate's fence at Cranberry Portage, but may I remind the honourable member that the relationship between the Department of Education and an official trustee and any of his staff is no different than that between a Department of Education and any other school board. At the present time, I'm not quite sure whether it's mandatory that a school board fence school properties or whether there's merely legislation within the School Act allowing the expenditure of funds for the construction of school fences if a school board should so decide. However, whichever it may be, Mr. Speaker, the official trustee and the Superintendent of the School Division did discuss this matter and he is quite well aware of my views and my attitude toward fences, particularly fences of a style and design that may be found to be offensive to the people of the community, and I am sure that the Frontier School Division administration will act accordingly in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Riel, I believe, and the Member for Lakeside asked a series of questions relative to the DC transmission line and as to whether or not the use of mercury arc technology was causing undue problems in power transmission. I undertook to ascertain the facts and I can advise my honourable friends that valve groups 1 and 2 are installed and functioning. Some minor difficulties were being experienced and they have been progressively overcome, and the transmission system, valve groups 1 and 2 mercury arc, is already transmitting in the order of 500 megawatts of DC power and valve group 3 is expected to be commissioned some time later this month, and valve group 4 some time May of next year, by which time there will be approximately a 1,000 megawatt transmission capability.

I can also advise the Honourable the Member for Lakeside and the Leader of the Opposition that their question yesterday as to whether Mr. Cass-Beggs was responsible for the utilization of mercury arc and the problems associated therewith, that I am advised that the decision as to the utilization of mercury arc was taken in August of 1967. So if my honourable friends want to smear they had better smear themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, again I direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Have any contracts for highway construction been let in Manitoba during the past six weeks

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) for projects which have not received the approval of this Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, no way.

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

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Health, and it relates to the answer he gave to the question put yesterday on Concordia Hospital vacancy rate. In view of the fact that the hospital facilities of the province are being over-taxed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ASPER: . . . can he account, can the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again may I remind the honourable member that pre-facing a question with an assumption which may be debatable is not permissible. Now it may be that the honourable member believes that that's correct and a fact but someone else may disagree, so let us not preface questions that way. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Health. Are the hospitals in Greater Winnipeg operating at maximum capacity with the exception of Concordia Hospital?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that such a question could have been posed the other day but since it wasn't and since I didn't take that part of the question posed today as notice, I'll undertake to have an answer brought forward to the honourable members during my Estimates.

MR. ASPER: Has the Minister of Health examined and can he make an explanation why the occupancy rate at Concordia Hospital is only 74 percent, I believe he said, and 26 percent below capacity?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, that too, if the honourable member remains in the House, could be explained during my Estimates.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. In the light of the 26 percent vacancy figure he's indicated to the House, can he explain why it is his government's policy to expand the hospital facilities in Manitoba in Greater Winnipeg?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there will be details given, not only pertaining to Concordia Hospital, but other hospitals in Manitoba pertaining to capital expenditures that have been committed over the last few years and what is projected in the future, and hopefully that that will answer the largest part of the question of the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister can advise the House and the people of Manitoba, are we going to face a Spring, a Summer or a Fall election?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer in short is no. That date has not yet been ascertained.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, further to my reply to the question put to me by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, it's been drawn to my attention that there is a piece of legislation entitled The Boundary Lines and Line Fences Act, and it contains a provision within it--well Section 41, that where adjoining owners or occupiers of land disagree as to what is a lawful fence, that they may appoint fence viewers to resolve the issue. So I may ask the parties concerned to appoint fence viewers to deal with this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his point of order.

MR. WATT: The Minister has asked me . . . to one of the backbenchers of the government. Is the Minister answering a question to one of the backbenchers of the government?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order then. The other day we were accused in the House by the First Minister of prolonging the question period, that we were deliberately extending the question period far and beyond what it ever had been in other administrations before.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. WATT: My point of order is why has the Minister not taken these matters up in caucus rather than taking up the time of the Opposition to ask questions of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. To begin with that is not a point of order. The procedures of this House are that the Speaker will recognize all members equally. I hope I am doing that. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister of Education why he hasn't answered the correspondence to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Riel asked a series of questions as to whether or not there was a drawdown on Lake Winnipeg and the tributaries of Lake Winnipeg which would be causing future problems this summer relative to hydro generation. I undertook to check and can advise my honourable friend the Member for Riel, in his absence, that Manitoba Hydro is represented on the Lake of the Woods Control Board by virtue of having one member on it. There is one from Ontario and two from the Government of Canada, and the Manitoba Hydro has been making presentations to the Lake of the Woods Control Board to have reductions in the outflow of these lakes beginning actually March 1 of 1973, and made these presentations based on snow survey information.

The Lake of the Woods Control Board has passed instruments or resolutions imposing reductions in the outflow from both of the lakes in four stages, up to April the 15th, and both of these reservoirs are now flowing at minimum levels in order to respond for next winter's operations. Rainfall, as honourable members know, has been low in the area and it is anticipated that without substantial rainfall both of these lakes will be lower than normal this summer. The Grand Rapids Forebay is under Manitoba Hydro control and the situation there is that there's three feet of storage left in the reservoir and it is now in what would be referred to as a normal ponding sequence. The future prospects for refilling this reservoir look satisfactory. The only situation now relative to Lake Winnipeg is whether or not temporary controls will be somehow put in place this summer to ensure satisfactory water levels next winter. Insofar as Manitoba Hydro exporting power and thus drawing down reservoirs, I am advised that this is simply not the case at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Does the Honourable Member for Roblin have another question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Transportation will advise the House if he's satisfied that all the PR roads in Roblin constituency are in good shape?

MR. PAULLEY: I take offence at my honourable friend's question. I don't know whether he was referring to transportation matters or Deputy Returning Officers.

MR. MCKENZIE: My error. To the Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear the question.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and rephrase the question. I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Highways can advise the House if he's satisfied that all the PR roads in Roblin constituency are in good condition today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Oh, Mr. Speaker. As far as satisfying everybody, I think the honourable member should know that there's no man on this earth has ever been able to satisfy everybody.

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

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the people of Manitoba expect an increase in the minimum wage before October 1st, 1973?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: That is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that's under consideration by the Minister of Labour at the present time, and he will be making a recommendation to his Cabinet and, if accepted at that particular time, it will be revealed to all of the people of Manitoba, the results of those deliberations.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. MCKELLAR: I'd like to ask another question. Will this be revealed at election time?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend could tell me when the election is going to be held I would be in a better position to answer him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I wonder if he could tell us whether the people who are on day parole are included in the statistics that he has given us, employment and unemployment statistics for Manitoba, whether they are included in those statistics.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend the answer to that may be found in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, which organization compiled the content of the statistics that are used for unemployment figures throughout the whole of the Dominion of Canada.

MR. BOROWSKI: Sir, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is responsible for the provincial statistic gathering service, I believe. Could he indicate whether these people are included in the statistics that he gives us periodically in this House?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): If the honourable member is referring to the Statistics Canada survey of employment and unemployment which are revealed in this House and are published in the papers from time to time, I can indicate to him that the basis of those surveys are the same right across Canada and that is, the basis is a sample survey, a scientific sample survey of households. So households are samples and whoever happens to live in that household and who happens to be selected as a sample will be asked the question whether or not they're available for work and whether or not they're employed or unemployed.

MR. BOROWSKI: I take it then that a jail would not be considered a household for the purposes of statistics gathering.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — SPEED-UP

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Colleges and Universities, that for the remainder of the session the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., in the evening from 8:00 p.m., and each sitting to be a separate sitting, and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and that the Rules with respect of the 10:00 o'clock p.m. adjournment be suspended, and that government business take precedence over all other business of the House; And that for the remainder of the session, the operation of sub-rule (3) of Rule 88 of The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the House be suspended, but that the report stage of any bill shall not be taken into consideration prior to 24 hours following the presentation of the report of the Standing or Special Committee with respect thereto.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. Order, please. Does the Honourable Minister wish to introduce this? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this resolution, and it is a resolution that has been historically presented to the Assembly at this time of a session, I note that some members have indicated a wonderment as to when we're going to cease the deliberations in the House for some reason, presumed or otherwise presumed, may . . . I do want to indicate, I do just want to indicate to the House as has been done -- (Interjection) -- Well if you're wearing blinkers I can't help it. But Mr. Speaker, I do want to indicate that this is something that is not unusual, that the former administrations, both Liberal and Conservative, introduced a similar bill and I know that I was involved with both Liberals and Conservatives, and I opposed them with the caveat that the business of the House be completed. And I give that undertaking now as I did last year. And also, Mr. Speaker, I also give the undertaking that if acceptable to the House that this bill, or resolution, will not be invoked until the expiration of the 90 hours of deliberation for Estimates. There is no intention of doing otherwise.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — SPEED-UP

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

The motion presented this year, Mr. Speaker, is slightly different than previous motions. If you recall, Sir, when we go into separate sittings, each sitting is presumed to be a day. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I know. -- (Interjection) -- But--oh no, that was only under the Conservative regime. Except, Mr. Speaker, when it was by agreement of all members of the House to complete deliberations last year. We did stay until 5:30 by unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: But Mr. Speaker, what I want to point out is there is a difference in the motion before the House this year dealing with the question of separate sittings. When we were considering the matter in Rules Committee, the question was raised as to whether or not we would not consider the advisability of having a 24-hour period rather than a sitting presumed to be 24 hours, before dealing with the report stage from a Standing or Select committee. And that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that the motion that I have presented today calls for, in the second paragraph, that the report stage on any bill shall not be taken into consideration prior to 24 hours. And we mean that 24 hours literally and not, as it has been construed in the past, as meaning a separate sitting of the House. In this way, Mr. Speaker, I think we're accommodating the desires of the House and overcoming some of the difficulties that we had encountered under previous administrations where each sitting was considered as being a day. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend from Souris-Killarney I know used to join me in protesting that particular. . . So I again, Mr. Speaker, I say in presenting this motion it is not our intention, if acceptable by the House, to invoke it prior to the conclusion of Estimates, and also we do take into consideration objectives made previously and such objections that were considered by the Committee of Rules.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Would you accept a question?

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well my question to the Minister introducing the Speed-up motion is this: Have the members of the House an assurance that there will be no bills introduced after the Speed-up motion is put in?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can give to my honourable friend, that we do not intend to proceed any differently than any other government in the Province of Manitoba has done in the past, and no government, and no government (oh, I have a word for you) and no government has ever given assurance in the line of the question of my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie, because I recall, Mr. Speaker, last year — I believe it was last year — after the government had completed introducing its bills, a couple of private members of the Conservative Party asked me at that time in my capacity as House Leader, whether they might introduce a couple of bills because of the private nature or municipal nature. I believe the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was one of those that asked me, as House Leader, whether I would accommodate his municipality or area, and I said "most assuredly." So having done that, Mr. Speaker, I think that I must take the position that I cannot give any guarantee to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that no bills will be introduced after we've started . . .

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

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Acting House Leader if he would expand his remarks to indicate to the House whether he will make a commitment, or give an assurance, that should the Speed-up resolution be passed, that the committee work of this Legislature will continue on a planned and organized basis, the Public Utilities Committee, the Economic Affairs Committee and the Public Accounts Committee, all of which are in session now.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend, it has been more or less historic that if the committees themselves make a recommendation to the House that they continue their deliberations after prorogation, the House has taken into consideration those requests. I cannot give my honourable friend the assurance that automatically they will continue because, in accordance with the rules of the House, when the House prorogues those committees die until the next session of the House.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise at this

ORDERS OF THE DAY — SPEED-UP

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) time mainly because the Acting House Leader and the Minister of Labour pointed his finger at me and at that time he was absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. I did at the dying stages of a particular sitting of this House. . . --(Interjection) --

MR. PAULLEY: Is my honourable friend asking a question?

MR. GRAHAM: No.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh well, may I just complete my remarks, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend would allow me just to correct what may be, by inadvertence, an impression that I gave to the House, to the members of the Assembly, and that refers to a matter that I used the phraseology, I think, saying "to complete the business of the House". I don't mean by that, Mr. Chairman, that every particular item will be carried through to its ultimate end. There have been occasions in the past when certain resolutions, indeed certain bills, both government and private, have not been dealt with when it becomes obvious that it is the desire of the House to terminate its business. So I don't want it misunderstood, Mr. Speaker, by the use of that phrase. I meant everything, every bill and every "i" would be dotted and every "t" will be crossed. So I want that clearly understood.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I'll start again. The Minister of Labour and the Acting House Leader made reference to a bill that I had brought forward rather late in the particular session. But, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the Minister of Labour may have lost two or three years some place along the line. I think that was back in 1969 or 70, so that there's been . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GRAHAM: There's been considerable water go under the bridge since that occurred, Mr. Speaker, and we have found that since that time the perennial Speed-up motion has gradually taken a little different twist each year. And there were two statements that the Minister made that I think require a little clarification. The first time he made reference to the Estimates he said that Speed-up would not occur before the 90 hours of debate on Estimates was up. And then later, Mr. Speaker, he said that it would not occur before the completion of Estimates.

Now I want to know from the Minister which of these two statements is correct or if either one is correct, or which one has the most likely possibility of being correct. There is a vast difference, Mr. Speaker, in whether it is the time of 90 hours of debate on Estimates or whether he is talking about the completion of Estimates which in the opinion of most people who have studied this at all anyway, it includes concurrence. So that the Acting House Leader has left us with a conflicting view here and I would hope that when he concludes debate on this resolution that he will clarify for all members of the House exactly which stage he intends to proceed with it.

I want to speak for a little while, Mr. Speaker, on the proposal of the government in introducing Speed-up and the timing that is included in their proposals. This is occurring at a time when we have had one government bill, Mr. Speaker — actually we've had two but one is almost automatic, the automatic one is the Interim Supply Bill — but there's only been one government bill that has had third reading. We have had bills sitting on the Order Paper for weeks, Mr. Speaker, in various stages of debate, that have been completely ignored, almost forgotten, and we are expected to pick up the thread once we get into the Speed-up, and once again try and carry on from where we left off with the various bills. There has really been no orderly process of bringing forward legislation in this particular session, Mr. Speaker, and I think if you look back on the 1969-70-71-72 sittings, you find that in each session the disorder and the disarray and the presentation of government legislation gets exceedingly worse with each succeeding year. It's disheartening, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, for a member to not know how the affairs of government are going to proceed. I'm sure it's disheartening to the people who are vitally affected by bills, people who have been alerted five, six, seven weeks ago that their bill has passed to the committee stage and they are going to have the opportunity to appear before committee to make their presentations known, and this generally, Mr. Speaker, occurs in Law Amendments Committee where the majority of the bills go, and yet this Law Amendments Committee has never even met yet. We've had bills that have been sitting there for weeks; we've had people waiting for weeks to make their presentations, and nothing has happened. There has been no indication that these bills are going to committee or when they will be going to committee. In all likelihood we will be holding committee meetings maybe 10:00 o'clock in the morning, maybe 10:00 o'clock at night, and later, and I suggest to you,

ORDERS OF THE DAY -- SPEED-UP

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) Mr. Speaker, that this may not be the best way for government to communicate with the people which they are supposed to represent. We have seen occasions in the past, and I'm sure we'll see them again this session, where Law Amendments Committee, and other committees, where the public representations will be heard, will be sitting from 10:00 in the morning maybe till 11:00, 12:00, or later, at night -- (Interjection) -- and possibly later than that, Mr. Speaker. And I suggest to you that if government is concerned about hearing the views of the community of the Province of Manitoba that an orderly procession of legislation, with plenty of time for advance notice for public representation, should have occurred long before now in this present session. I don't think that the government is acting in the best interests of the people, and I at this time wish to register my protest at the manner in which the government has been treating the people of this province.

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

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

. . . . Continued on next page.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 32

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether you'd mind calling Bill No. 32.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

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

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I had some notes on this bill but I don't know where they are, but I know enough about what it means and I'd like to just say a very few words regarding it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard so much from the government of the day, from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, about the dirty old insurance companies who are operating in the Province of Manitoba, how they raised premiums, how they overcharged people, and lo and behold what does The Fires Prevention Act amendment say? Who is going to take this increase. I'll tell you what the increase is, Mr. Speaker. When we were in power the most we ever charged for fire prevention, even though it said you can go to one percent, was one-half of one percent. So the government of the day when they were elected they raised it to one percent. And what does the bill say? Amendments to Fire Prevention - it says you can go to two percent. Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, who is he kidding? Who is he kidding? They're just saying two percent because they want two percent, and they're going to charge the people. What happens, Mr. Speaker? Every \$100.00 of fire insurance premiums is paid by every person of the Province of Manitoba who insures their property, private property or otherwise. Two percent of every dollar will go to the Minister of Labour for fire prevention. Mr. Speaker, that isn't the only money that the government of the province collects because all during the period of every government two percent premium tax on top of that is paid to the Province of Manitoba. So what does this mean? Four percent. Now don't blame high insurance costs on the insurance companies, blame them on the government of the day. They're the ones who are to blame. They can go up and down this province all during an election and say about those bad insurance companies who have done business over the last 100 years in the Province of Manitoba and condemn them all they like, but the very blame lies right over there, right on the Cabinet side, the men who are bringing in this bill.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. This is wrong. What will it do to me, fire prevention do to me on my farm, the property I insure, where I pay at least about \$200.00 premium for it? It won't do anything for me, and yet I'm told that I've got to pay \$2.00 out of every \$100.00 for fire prevention. Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. It's wrong. The Minister says he isn't going to collect it. If he isn't going to collect it, why bring the amendments in? That's all I have--he's got the power to collect one percent right today, which he's collecting.

Mr. Speaker, in the judgment of the people of the Province of Manitoba I ask all the people to think about this and lo and behold right at election time when all this propaganda is coming out about Autopac, saying how cheap it is, but Autopac don't pay no two percent, no dollar comes off Autopac for paying for fire prevention, it comes off all the fire insurance premiums that people pay towards fire insurance protection in the Province of Manitoba. And I say this is wrong, and I ask all members of this Chamber to vote against this bill in the best interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The sentiments that have been expressed by the Member for Souris-Killarney I think are sentiments that are quite the feeling of the people of Manitoba. Here we find another insignificant little bill which doubles the taxation levied by this government. We've had our First Minister through publications, no doubt during the election campaign, and in his Budget Speech, and throughout the province, saying that this government has reduced taxation in the Province of Manitoba. And yet we find that the really reverse is true. Here we find a doubling in the Fire Prevention Act. We find in other bills that fees have been increased. We find that from 1969 where the total revenue of the province was in the three hundred million class, that today it is doubled. The province is receiving almost twice as much from the taxpayer as they were just four years ago. And yet we find that the First Minister is saying that taxation has reduced. Something doesn't add up,

BILL 32

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) Mr. Speaker. We find in this Act, we find a doubling of taxation, and we find in other Acts that there's a doubling.

Mr. Speaker, I will admit, and I will give the Minister of Labour credit, that by the use of this Act he is bringing in to the Legislature for the consideration of all members of the Legislature a direct taxation. We find however that there are two methods of taxation available to governments, one is the taxation through direct legislation, which all members of the House have a right to participate in the debate, and there's the indirect method which is done through regulation, through increased fees, fines, etc., which provides considerable revenue to the Province of Manitoba, and it's that indirect taxation that to me is the more insidious type. So I am pleased that the Minister in one sense has brought this in as a bill so that we in this House can debate the issue, and the issue, Mr. Speaker, whether it be the Fire Prevention Act, or any other Act, is a question of increased taxation levied by this government against the people of this province. And I support the stand taken by the Member from Souris-Killarney, and I think that we should oppose because we in this side of the House believe in less taxation rather than more.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that we should support the stand taken by the Member for Souris-Killarney and oppose the passing of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Member for Rock Lake had the adjournment and in effect then lost his right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for reminding me. That is correct. Is the House prepared to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

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

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer some of the questions posed of me yesterday. I'd like to start with some of the questions asked by the Member for Rhineland but he's not in the House, maybe I should wait awhile and see if he returns. In the meantime I'll deal with questions asked by the -- another member that's not in the House. I'll start with the Member for Rhineland and he can read it in Hansard.

The questions were in regards to information for the 20 percent equity contribution towards the capital cost of hospital construction. The honourable member wanted to know if that clause was still applicable. The answer to his question is yes. The regulations under the Health Services Insurance Act provide that 20 percent of the capital cost approved by the Commission shall be financed by the hospital.

He asked to what extent hospital districts are indebted at the present time. As at December 31st, 1972, hospitals in Manitoba that received capital cost allowances from the Manitoba Health Services Commission had outstanding capital debts of approximately \$71.4 million. Of this amount approximately \$7.6 million is a direct liability relating to the 20 percent owners' equity. The balance of the hospital liability, \$63.8 million, is being amortized over a period of 20 to 25 years, and annual allowances are included in the hospitals' operating budget for repayment of this debt.

The honourable member asked if the same yardsticks are being used for review by the Manitoba Health Services Commission of budgets for hospitals between, say, rural hospitals as from urban hospitals. The answer to this is yes. The Manitoba Health Services Commission in its annual review of hospital budgets applies established policies of a uniform basis to all hospitals to arrive at a rate of payment to the hospitals, bearing in mind the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) different services that are available in the various institutions. All hospitals over 50 beds are on a global budget, and all those under 50 beds are on a line by line budget calculation.

He asked about hospital deficits levied on municipalities. Hospital deficits levied against municipalities are only for those costs that have not been approved by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. These costs represent a very minimal proportion of total hospital deficits in any given year. Less than \$100,000 out of a deficit totalling 2.6 million. By the way the legislation which extends the authority for budget review and year-end deficit adjustment to the Commission goes back to the inception of the insured hospital plan in 1958.

The honourable member asked about the per diem rates for hospitals in Manitoba. We can if the honourable member so wishes provide him with a copy of rates approved for hospitals in past years. However the honourable member should know that this information is available now, and has been for many years, and is published in the Gazette following approval by regulations of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I have with me a copy of the regulation respecting 1972 rates of payment to hospitals and will provide this to the honourable member if he so wishes, and all other honourable members in the House.

The honourable member asked about the \$30 million capital supply bill for hospital construction projects. In the past hospitals have traditionally obtained their long term financing requirements by issuing debentures. As marketing conditions changed hospitals began encountering difficulties in raising the required financing. In order to assist operators of hospitals the Hospital Capital Financing Authority was established by an Act of the Legislature. Besides insuring an orderly market for the sale of securities issued by hospitals, the Authority is empowered to purchase the hospital securities with money borrowed by the Authority. When the Authority was established the long term requirements within the immediate future was calculated to be \$30 million of this amount.

(a) 17 million is required for projects completed between 1968 and 1972.

(b) Although a temporary freeze was placed on hospital construction all projects were not affected. For instance to alleviate the winter employment situation in Manitoba, in 1971/72 certain rural projects were accelerated. The borrowing requirements for these projects is \$5 million.

(c) In addition there were other projects which were in final planning stages. The borrowing requirement of these accounted for the remaining \$8 million of the 30 million Capital Supply Bill.

Interim financing of hospital construction projects is handled through short-term borrowing. It is expected that the authority will go to the market for the full \$30 million during the next two years.

I believe that this answers the questions posed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland apart from the request he made to get a more detailed analysis of the amount asked for by the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and I do have copies of the \$70 million required by the Health Services Commission—to be exact, 7,588,000, plus 4.8 million for the waiver of premiums for senior citizens, and \$21 million in supplementary estimates for the waiving of premiums for all citizens in Manitoba to cut off totally the very negative tax imposed by the previous administration, for a grand total of 96.388 million dollars. There are copies available for all members of the House, if I can have a Page to distribute them.

And for the information of all members of the House, Mr. Chairman, the regulation that I was making reference to is a regulation dated October 14th, 1972, Volume 101, No. 41.

The Honourable Member for Osborne asked me, I believe it was three questions, one dealing with special dependent care. And I'd like to deal with that question in the few moments that I have available. The question is whether persons receiving special dependent care will benefit from the waiving of health premiums, or whether the amount they pay for their special care will be increased by the amount saved. That's the way I understood the question. The member has acknowledged that according to the existing regulations the amount paid for special care must be increased equal to the savings on health premiums. He has requested that we therefore amend these regulations so that the benefits may be passed on. I would first of all like to reassure the member that I am in complete agreement with the principle that these persons should gain something as a result of abolishing premiums, health and medical premiums.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)

Unfortunately the method to allow this principle to happen in practice is a little more complex. The original social allowance regulations in 1967 made needs testing for special dependent care, a very open procedure. However, these regulations had to be repealed due to the objections of Canada Assistance Plan officials in 1968 before we took office. Since then we have had to move closer to the basic social allowance needs test for all recipients, including recipients of special dependent care. This was not the previous government's decision in 1968, and it is not our decision today. It is part and parcel of the Canada Assistance Plan.

I would like to remind the honourable member that we have a silent partner in the administration of social allowances, namely, the Federal Government. Administration of social allowance program according to an agreement with Canada, and therefore we are not always able to simply act unilaterally in correcting apparent injustice. Having said this, I will add that there has been a good deal of discussion concerning the possibility of a special test for eligibility for dependent care. This is the only way we will be able to pass on the savings in health premiums and I have asked my department to develop a program and policy to this end, around which would begin our negotiations with the Canada Assistance Plan.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is finding what else he's going to deal with there, if I could ask him a question. That means in fact then that the people that are now receiving assistance, and who are in fact maintaining themselves in a job, will not benefit from the elimination of the medical care premium, until these negotiations are completed. That is my understanding of what you said, I assume that's correct.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, my last remarks indicated that we are negotiating now and we still have a few days, a few weeks, before the policy to abolish totally the premiums take effect, and hopefully that we can conclude the negotiations before these individuals are affected.

The other question posed of me was in regards to the Mental Health Research Foundation, and that was equally a question asked of me by the Member for Flin Flon. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can state that my government supports expanded research in the field of mental health. This is one of the major health problems of our country. It has in the past been a neglected area. Our government is committed to an increase emphasis on all aspects of care and cure for the mentally ill, and this of course includes research on mental illness. However, it is also our responsibility to safe-guard the expenditure of public funds and to ensure that public funds are used in the best way possible. This means that since there is not an infinite supply of money available for research on mental illness, it is our duty as elected representatives to single out the areas of highest priority for funding. We are willing, Mr. Chairman, to consider funding of specific research projects. A project must be considered on its own merits and in line with other proposals. We are not willing to hand over \$300,000 to a number of citizens to decide on what project this money would be spent. This would not only be evading our responsibility as government, it would also represent an irresponsible attitude towards public funds.

If a private board, such as the Mental Health Research Foundation, can draw up an agenda on research proposals, we will consider these proposals. In fact I would like to take this opportunity to invite research proposals in the field of mental health. However, to my knowledge, the Mental Health Research Foundation has not presented any specific research program to me or my officials. We will wait for the Foundation to present their program; until that time I cannot in good confidence recommend to Cabinet that the Foundation be handed an unconditional grant.

There were, Mr. Chairman, quite a few questions asked pertaining to the nursing home policy announced by this government, that is the coverage of all health facilities as of the 1st of July, 1973. I'll refer to that policy as the Nursing Home Program, but that really means the coverage of all, all health facilities as of the 1st of July.

The implementation of the Nursing Home Program is being directed by a Steering Committee consisting--and I hope the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is listening because she's shown a lot of concern, that is she and especially the Member for Morris--directed by a Steering Committee consisting of staff of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and invited representatives of the nursing home operators, the Manitoba Health organizations, formally the Manitoba Hospital Association, the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, the Manitoba Medical Association, and the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The first

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) objective of the Steering Committee has been to protect the independence of individuals who are forced by frailty, disability or isolation to live in institutions instead of in their own home.

The establishment of a prepaid system for special care over and above residential arrangements will prevent the depletion of assets commonly resulting from such care needs in a welfare system. Every effort is being made to avoid disruption of family and place of residence when admission to a personal care home takes place. Detailed policies are now being received from the Steering Committee after approval of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

At this point in time I can indicate and outline the admitting procedure. Application may originate from any health or social service agency or personnel. The applicant will require medical nursing and social assessment. The nursing and social assessment will be handled by experienced staff on a regional basis as they are now. The first approach will be to provide care at home rather than admit to an institution. And I stress this point, Mr. Chairman. The first approach will be to provide care at home rather than admit in an institution. Our ability to provide care at home will be greatly enhanced by an expansion of home nursing and home making services, especially outside Metropolitan Winnipeg.

The selection of applicants will be on a priority of need for care when every consideration has been given to care at home. The cost of home care services will be paid by the program. The cost of home care services will be provided under the control and direction of regional offices. The board and operators of nursing homes have been kept apprised of the work of the Steering Committee and many meetings in Winnipeg and throughout the province as well as by representation of the Steering Committee.

It has been an aim of this government to incur the amalgamation of boards, not direct, not force, but an aim of this government to incur the amalgamation of boards providing health services. That aim precedes the insured nursing home program and continues, apart from the nursing home program, no board is threatened by these policies.

There are now, Mr. Chairman, 5,000 nursing homes and 1,800 hospital beds in Manitoba. On the basis of a recently completed assessment of patient care needs, we propose to redesignate the nursing home beds as 2,800 personal care beds, and 2,200 extended treatment centre beds, with no change in the 1,800 beds currently designated as hostel beds. --(Interjection)-- Can I just finish my sentence and then I'll accept the question.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . the figures are a little too fast for us to catch.

MR. TOUPIN: I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that Hansard will pick it up. They're pretty quick at picking up things. But I'll say them again. I'll say them again, as long as --(Interjection)-- in French did the member say? Polish. Well I'm sorry I can't say very many words in Polish. There are now 5,000 nursing home beds and 1,800 hostel beds in Manitoba. On the basis of a recently completely assessment of patient care needs, we proposed to redesignate the nursing home beds as 2,800 personal care beds, and 2,200 extended treatment centre beds, with no change in the 1,800 beds currently designated as hostel beds. Did we get that?

The level of care provided in these beds will include supervision in hostels, personal and nursing care in personal care homes, and specialized supportive and restorative care in extended treatment. The last grouping is being duly introduced. It may be compared to the auxiliary hospitals in the Province of Alberta. It is our policy to combine these levels of care in one institution where possible to avoid the forcing of a change of residence where there is a change in the individual's care requirements.

The policies being prepared by the Steering Committee are being forwarded by the Manitoba Health Services Commission for approval by Cabinet and inclusion in regulations. I can indicate that they are designed to assure that couples are not separated when only one needs care. That a resident is free and encouraged to take reasonable leave from the home and that in the event of hospital admission there is reasonable assurance of return to the home of his choice. The recommendations allow for preferred accommodation controlled as to the maximum number of beds which may be identified as preferred, and as to the charges that may be made to the patient.

Eligibility for coverage is to be based on residents of sufficient durations to prevent an influx of applicants from areas where nursing home care is not ensured. There will be a residential charge of \$4.50 per day consistent with every person's responsibility for his own

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) maintenance within his ability; this charge is proposed as realistic for the service covered and within the means of every person over 65. For those without sufficient income to finance the residential charge, the Province of Manitoba will still assist such individuals as recipients of public assistance. The policies outlined are for immediate application. We are aware of problems of distribution of beds and instances of low standards of service. These problems will be foremost when the initial steps have been implemented. We are fully aware that beyond ensuring this program for nursing home care, we will be responsible for equitable distribution of beds and for the standard of care provided in them.

I hope Mr. Chairman, that this at least helps to clarify some of the questions that we had in regards to the new policy becoming in force on the 1st of July, 1973 in regards to the insurance of all levels of care in Manitoba, including home care services.

I am again going back to a comment made by, I believe, the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Fort Garry--they're forming a common front--and this is in regard to expenditures in different provinces in Canada in regards to health care and expenditures in the amounts of million dollars per population, that is per capita expenditure per province. And I again state that Manitoba ranks as the lowest in Canada and those figures are figures for 1972. I'll just indicate the lowest expenditure of million dollars Manitoba, excluding Capital Account, 693.5, including Capital Expenditure 755.6 million dollars, per capita, including Capital Expenditure, 762, being the lowest, No. 1, in Canada. The highest happens to be Newfoundland, expenditures 674.5 million per capita expenditure of 1,268.

There was a question posed by the Member for Brandon West, and maybe I could just expand briefly on the answer I gave him in regards to the Brandon Correctional Institution. Plans for the replacement of an archaic correctional institution at Brandon are proceeding satisfactory and without delay. Functional plan for the multi-facet building has been completed by the design consultant in conjunction with departmental staff, and the Department of Public Works has been asked to develop proposal drawings and to prepare preliminary costs. It is estimated that excavation for the new 92 person facility will commence in the late fall of this year. The new institution will serve the Catchment Area, of which Brandon is the centre, and will accommodate in distinctively segregated areas sentenced and remanded men and women as well as providing a detention facility for juveniles. I could give more details on the institution once the plans are completely terminated.

Mr. Chairman, there were questions asked of me by the Member for Rhineland which I felt I dealt with; the Member for Fort Rouge indicated that I had not answered sufficiently the questions asked by the Member for Morris. I feel that maybe I dealt with some of the questions that the Member for Morris asked pertaining to how we will deal with the additional coverage of all health facilities, and the meetings that are taking place now with different personal care home boards, and so on.

I did give some details on the question of day care services and the program at an earlier date, and I wish the honourable member would make reference to that.

There's one comment that was made by the Member for Fort Rouge that I, that I really can't understand in a sense. She did make reference to part of the report of Professor Barber's Report, that poverty in Manitoba is, that the poverty line is 25 to 31 percent, and she indicated that Manitobans--well I will bring forward as soon as I possibly can get the accurate figures, what the poverty line was say in 1966, 67 and 68, and how it relates to today, and what has been done since 1968 in the last four years. And the honourable member, and I'm subject to correction, mentioned that she felt that Manitobans will not benefit by the elimination of Medical and Hospital premiums because they will lose control. Well there is no such intention on the part of the government even though we've cut that very negative tax completely, which was \$204.00 a year for a family back in April 1969, now will be completely nil. This is definitely a benefit for all Manitobans. I don't see how the honourable member can say that it will not benefit Manitobans, and we will not take control. I've tried to say this on many occasions but she always comes back and tries to indicate to the Members of this House that the government has wanted to centralize all power within government service. And it's the contrary that's happening. First of all we're decentralizing services that had previously been offered through Winnipeg. We're sending that down into the different regions and districts in the Province of Manitoba. We're not taking away autonomy of regional boards, of hospital boards, of personal care boards, and so on. We're adding on to that. When we're talking of community health

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) and social development centres, we don't want to run them. We never said that the Department of Health and Social Development wanted to run these facilities. We're wanting the people in the locality to be responsible.

A MEMBER: You're on the wrong side.

MR. TOUPIN: So what's happening? I don't really understand the honourable member. Is she trying to throw sand in our eyes so we won't see --(Interjection)--

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Well, Mr. Speaker, I just had a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: I just had a question. He's talking about these people not being concerned. I have letters in front of me, and I'm sure that he's received many, that they are concerned because the way your representatives out in the country is explaining it, they're not giving them the answers they want, and you know just as sure as you're sitting over there and I'm here, that you have letters in front of you that they aren't convinced of these things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. What is the question?

MR. TOUPIN: . . . I believe the Honourable Member for Pembina interpreted me incorrectly. I didn't say that the boards were not concerned. I said that we as a province have no intention of taking over their responsibility. And we have had meetings with them over the last years, and we will, it is our intention to give those additional responsibilities pertaining to health and related social services to responsible people in the region, and the district, and in the towns, and the given areas where we will have these facilities. That's what we're saying. You don't understand that. It's there. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: Write him a note.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions and I've not taken too much time of the Minister's time but something that he has said concerns me, and that's to do with mental health. I'm sure that it's safe to say mental illness is not a disease it's a problem of living, and the Minister indicated that he'd be cutting down or not giving the grants to the mental research, and this is what concerns me because, Mr. Chairman, in the last few years, I believe it's through drugs and new techniques and preventative measures that the mental hospitals have been emptied not only in this province, but right across Canada, and because the treatment is done in General Hospitals and not in Mental Institutions. At the same time there's still at least one out of ten people that require some medical attention as far as mental illness is concerned. There is as many as 75,000 people still, I believe, in institutions in Canada, so this is an area that there has been great progress made but I feel that we should continue with a research program, the kind that has been carried out where it has helped these people.

The other point is I wonder to what extent when these people are rehabilitated and gone home, to what extent have they been able to take their proper place in society in the way of getting jobs and getting placed in jobs, and perhaps the Minister would have some indication or some record.

My other question is to do with foster children and what is the--you call it per diem or the amount that the foster parents get for every child that's placed in a foster home. I believe it's something like \$1.75 or less, somewhere in that neighborhood, but I don't believe there has been an increase in this area in the last six or seven years. I understand that the Federal Government has increased their costs, or per diem assessment, to foster parents as far as some of the native people, or the Indian people are concerned, which we have not raised this for the foster parents in the province, and I feel this is a very good program. In fact I believe that there should be a subsidized adoption program for older children in the age group of say 8 to 10 or 12, because they, I believe have a much better chance and opportunity in life when they have parents, be they acting parents, instead of being put into institutions, and I feel there must be some subsidized adoption program as far as the older children are concerned, because, Mr. Chairman, it is not my opinion, but I'm sure most members would agree that preventative measures perhaps are the least expensive costs as far as medical attention is concerned, and I'm sure that the Minister would be the first one to agree.

The other question I wish to pose to him, and he has talked about the homemaker or my question to him is, before you can get somebody to come in to a home to look after children, say if the Mother wants to go to work, how many children does there have to be in a family?

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) Can you get somebody to come in--I believe, it's to do with Family Bureau as well as--how many children does there have to be in a home before you can get somebody to look after children while the Mother has to go to work? Is there any required number or, I believe, even if the mother would be able to go to work and be able to pay some of the cost of the homemaker, but would there be some sharing in the cost say if there is only two children? I don't know what the requirement is--is it four children at the present time before you can get somebody to come in? So these are the questions I pose to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments in regards to the Minister's Department, and having listened to him make his--the comments he made just before he sat down makes me wonder just what goes on in his department when he says he is interested in the comments that come from the people who are directly interested and working on behalf of our health institutions.

Let me quote one example, and the Sanatorium in Ninette has been one that has been in the news media for some months now. I can say to him that this is in the constituency of Souris-Killarney, the Member for Souris-Killarney, but it's an institution that's been of interest to the whole southern and western part of Manitoba. Doctors have been concerned about it wondering what was going to happen to that institution.

There's some questions that I would like to pose to the Minister now but before doing so I would like to challenge him on his comments that he made, and I hope he's not going to make a 30 minute speech to answer maybe a few direct questions. A committee was established in that area over the past few years to work in conjunction with the Minister's department as to what the future should be for that institution because it had served its purpose in curing those people who were there because of tuberculosis, and it was no longer an institution that they found necessary because of the advanced stages in medicine they were able to help people with that kind of disease. But I want to say to the Minister that the people in that part of Manitoba have given up in utter frustration because of the lack of interest in the Minister's attitude towards that institution and what they could do with it. I can say that my colleague from Souris-Killarney and I attended a meeting one evening not so many weeks ago, and the Minister sent his civil servant out there to answer on his behalf. He was told to tell the people that that institution would not be developed into a personal care home for senior citizens. They had other questions to pose to the gentleman who was speaking on behalf of the Minister. He wasn't able to answer them and as a result of this there was rather moments when we thought that the meeting was going to develop into utter futility on behalf of those who went out there. And I'm not sure, I'm not going to say that the Minister never did confront the people themselves personally, but I felt after listening to the comments at that meeting, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister had been accepting his responsibilities--now he can correct me if I'm wrong--but I don't know, I don't believe, he ever at any time attended a meeting out in that part of Manitoba, face to face with the people who are concerned with that particular problem.

The questions I have to pose in this connection, Sir, are this: Who possesses or holds the title to that Sanatorium or that institution? No. 2. There has been advertisements in the papers that that institution is for sale. The Sanatorium Board had been given apparently that authority, or maybe they do have that authority without permission of the Minister, to advertise the Sanatorium that it is for sale. The Minister has indicated in this House that there has been an offer of a quarter of a million dollars made towards the purchase of that institution. I would like to know who receives that money if a sale does happen to be transacted for that amount of money? Who receives that money, and what becomes of it? I'm sure that the people, not only in Souris-Killarney constituency but, as I've said a few moments ago, this concerns the people of the whole southern and western part of the province, and so we all have an interest in it. I know the people are wondering if it is sold for say a quarter of a million dollars, will the people in that part of the province get any benefit from it? That if it's not going to be used for a personal care home, and I know the people in the community have said, well if you the government can't see fit to use it for that purpose, can we use it for a tourist attraction, and can it be used to fit into that kind of a project? I think these are some of the things, Mr. Chairman, that the people in that part of the province are interested in knowing, and I would like to hear the comments from the Minister on those matters.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and be as brief as I possibly can. I well recognize the binder in here, we're only entitled to 90 hours to deal with the Estimates, but this is a very important department and it's interesting, you know, as we get to the dying hours of reviewing Estimates, I recall reviewing the Estimates some years back when we were doing the budget of those days with \$300,000, and we were allowed 80 hours. Now we're dealing with \$700,000, and we're only entitled to 90 hours --(Interjection)-- or millions rather, and days back, backbenchers, when I sat with the government, were not permitted to question the Ministers because you rise, the backbenchers rise and fall with their government, and so the estimator were basically left to the Opposition to deal with. I think it's the prerogative of the Opposition to investigate the estimates of the various Ministers, but the rules have changed. We also now have a couple of --(Interjection)-- well you can argue about it all you want but nevertheless that's what we're faced with, and here we're running out of time, we've only dealt with what-six departments --(Interjection)-- I agree but I'm going to try and explain to the Chairman the bind that we're in. I'll very briefly get to the point to show you that it's very difficult for the Opposition to devote the time and the skill that's necessary to review this enormous budget that we're facing today in the short time that's allocated to us.

I'm wondering if the honourable the Minister can describe to me some of the workload problems that the nursing home people are facing today. I'm familiar with nursing homes today that bring people in that are as healthy as I am to take the workload off some of the nurses in those nursing homes because they cannot possibly handle those heavy patients like at full capacity. So I'm wondering is that a problem, or is it something that maybe the Minister has in mind and can deal with? It's not possible to put hostels and things like that in, I understand, rural Manitoba-I understand some of the nursing homes are facing a very serious problem of the heavy care problem that they have in those, so they have to bring in patients that are not needing that kind of care to kind of cut down the workload, and I ask the Minister if that is a problem.

Can I ask the Honourable Minister about Deer Lodge? Where we are with Deer Lodge, and where that has gone? May I also ask the Honourable Minister about the \$4.50 deterrent fee, and I well recall the days when we raised the matter of Medicare in those days, and where it was not-it was a dirty word to raise a \$4.50 deterrent fee. The feds wouldn't buy it, and so there was no way-we were hung with a Medicare scheme where no deterrent fees were allowed, period. Now today we have-and this government over here didn't--they were in opposition then, but they hate deterrent fees the NDP for some reason, and maybe they've changed, and I'd like now to ask the Honourable Minister how he got this \$4.50 deterrent fee through his caucus because it's very interesting to find that now we're going to a \$4.50 deterrent fee which has been anti the policy of that government for a long, long time. And may I also ask him how he got that accepted by the Federal Government, or in fact is the province paying all these costs and the Federal Government are not part of that program?

I raised the question, Mr. Chairman, some time ago about the guaranteed annual income, the pilot project that we've been waiting with great interest, which I suspect is going to be Dauphin--I raised the question in those days. I don't think the Minister has announced that program. If he has I was unfortunately out of my chair, so if I was out I apologize and I'll try and follow it in Hansard. But it's difficult to follow. We're about three or four days behind in Hansard.

One more final question, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like the Honourable the Minister to clarify a statement that he made through the propaganda machine, the News Service, regarding, "Toupin Suggests July 1st Target Date for Changes." And in that great document that I have in my hand, and I read, "Mr. Toupin said the increase to \$20.00 would be welcomed but was still inadequate support for a child. The real goal of family allowance, he said, should aim at benefits approximating the full cost of child rearing." Is that the policy of government, the cradle to the grave? Or is this the Minister's philosophy, or is this where we're going with these programs? That you're going to dig up this kind of money, that you'll provide a family with the full cost of rearing your own child from the day it's born until the day it, what? reaches 18 or 20? I'd just like the Minister to clarify those statements. Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON: . . . I'm talking about local care homes in towns where they have people that are incapable of looking after themselves, and how will they be handled under this

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) program? Who determines whether they're heavy load care or whether they just need a reasonable amount of attention, and are these people going to be eligible under this scheme?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to take the last question first, there will be a board established to determine the level of care needed in consultation with the doctor in question and that will definitely be covered, that will be covered at the level that's needed for the patient and not determined, you know, by officials of my department, determined by boards that will be appointed, admission and discharge boards in consultation with the doctor in question.

Now, you know, the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, from Roblin has all the gall in the world. I wish I had a half an hour to answer him. He has the gall to say that we're imposing a deterrent fee pertaining to coverage of all levels of care in Manitoba. What, Mr. Chairman--Mr. Chairman, what did we have in Manitoba prior to this policy? What did we have? Can I tell you what we had in Manitoba prior to this policy? We had medical and hospital premiums of \$204.00 a year per family. What was that? Was that based on the ability to pay? The poor person with an annual income of \$2,000 had to pay that even if he had fourteen kids. Is that fair? How about the individual that went into a personal care home at a cost of \$350.00-\$450.00 a month? He had to pay it, every penny of that, every penny of that. That wasn't a deterrent fee imposed by the Conservatives, was it? Oh for Pete's sakes, the gall of the individual.

When we talk about \$4.50 per day cost to the individual, we're talking of a board and room cost. We're not saying you're going to pay \$400.00, \$450.00, \$500.00 a month. We're telling the individuals that can afford to pay, "We're going to charge you \$135.00 a month." Not as a deterrent fee but a board and room charge. A board and room charge. If they're able to stay at home and if it is determined by these boards and the doctor in question that the individual can be cared for at home, we're going to pay for the home care, for the Home Care Services. We said that. That's our policy. What happened in the previous administration? A VON nurse went to your home; you had to pay for it. You had to pay for that cost. We're saying we're going to cover that. We're going to cover every level of care in Manitoba after board and room has been taken. And the honourable member has the gall to call that a deterrent fee?

Look at deterrent fees that you imposed. Oh for Pete's sake. It's completely outrageous. I could just, you know, say such outrageous words to the honourable member for saying that but it wouldn't be parliamentary and I can't. --(Interjection)-- Truth? You look at the truth. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Rock Lake had friends or relatives that were placed in personal care homes that had \$10,000, \$15,000 in liquid assets, that had to take every cotton-pickin' penny of that and pay it out before they became wards of the state. If he hasn't--maybe he comes from a family and relatives that are very wealthy. I know that I had. I had so many of them, that took every penny, apart from, say, \$500.00 or \$700.00 that was set aside for their funeral. They had to spend every penny gained over a period of 40, 50 years, 40, 50, 60 years before they were picked up by the province. Is that the type of policy the honourable member wants? Surely it is because they didn't change it in ten years that they were in office. No. The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne was in the House when such policies were established. He was there. Did he change anything? Not at all. He's still there. Did he vote for the budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30--Order please. The hour being 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered a certain resolution and has asked me to report progress and begs 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 Osborne, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS - NO. 11

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour on resolutions on Wednesday. The first one is No. 8. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye is absent. No. 11 - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, proposed--the Honourable Member for Morris. The question must be debated since it's open. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Well in that case if no one is prepared to debate the motion--the Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may; I don't know whether there's some confusion that possibly the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was going to speak. Maybe some other member is desirous of speaking on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments I'd like to speak into the record regarding the resolution that was presented by my Leader regarding Resolution No. 11, the Publication of Complete Accounts of Programs, in which the Provincial Government is financially or administratively involved. And I think this becomes a sort of a fair question when you recognize some of the programs that are taking place around the province. I happen to have a program take place in my constituency where a gentleman from another province came in, from our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan, and became involved in one of these programs where certain government funds were appropriated to him to tear down a rink in a certain community, and I think that that type of explanation, the members of the House, I think the members of the community in which it's involved, there should be some explanation of that type of distribution of the people's money, taxpayers' dollars.

There's other programs that are questioned from time to time and I've had the question asked of me at many times today when we're talking about STEP grants. I happened to have a bunch of students phone me today and tell me that a certain STEP grant, they don't know if it's been turned down or if it's been approved. I can't help them because I have no information. I made certain phone calls. And so it's a sort of a back room type of deal, as I understand it, and I think if the programs were put on the table of the Legislature where members knew what was going on with these various programs, I don't think there's anybody quarreling with what the government is trying to do with some of these programs and that is to employ some of the people that are unemployed. But basically we're dealing with taxpayers' dollars and when we're dealing with taxpayers' dollars I think it is the right of the members of the Legislature to have some publication, even if it can't be debated, but there should be some breakdown of the accounts of these programs and what they're trying to do, what the government - maybe the Minister that could lay them on the table could say in fact, "Well this is what we're trying to do with these dollars," but as I stand here we get a gross figure and it seemingly ends about there. I can only speak for my own constituency but some of the programs I question. The one where the moneys went into another province for a program that was basically for the people of this province. I think some of the programs - and it's difficult when you're allocating tax dollars on various programs and certain people are allowed to administer those dollars and administer the program to make everything airtight so that it follows the policy at all times and I don't think there's anybody quarreling with that type of a problem. But I think at some day and some stage - if this is the future of the way we're going to try and stimulate the economy of this province and try and create jobs for people that are not able to find jobs by these various programs, I think that the day will have to come and I think the time would be maybe now, next year, next session, next parliament, where maybe some of these figures should be laid on the table.

So I with those few remarks think that the resolution is one that I certainly can support, and with the number of questions that have been raised from my constituency since these programs have been brought to the people in that area I think they as well as their member would like to have some of the answers to the various programs and the questions that are raised.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few remarks to make on this resolution as presented by the Leader of the Opposition. In the first Whereas he makes remarks that there's been in recent years a significant proliferation in ad hoc programs such as PEP and STEP and etc. I don't know what he means by "etc.", but I certainly don't agree with his assumption that these are "ad hoc" programs; especially when you find that the programs such as PEP--the effect that the PEP program has on reducing the unemployment rate in Manitoba to at least the second lowest province in the country is one of the avenues and moves that this government has made. I just don't see how the Leader of the Opposition can make such an accusation in that resolution.

Secondly of course these programs are at the request and the initiative of local residents in communities and community leaders, municipal councils, hospital boards and the like, and he's saying they're ad hoc. I think the Conservative Party should sit down and at least listen to the people of rural Manitoba the way this government has listened, and listen to the problems that they have had and develop programs such as this to deal with many of the problems they have and not criticize all local people in rural areas and say this is an ad hoc program.

The Member for Morris got up and said, you know, what kind of programs is this government approving, or projects under the PEP grant? He in effect is saying that any of the recommendations that municipal leaders in rural Manitoba are making are just full of baloney. That's what in effect he is saying, that any of the suggestions that the local leaders in our rural areas haven't any good suggestions. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestions that have come from local areas with respect to PEP, in my constituency for instance you have the fixing up of community halls and community centres, you have the fixing up of hospitals. For instance in Arborg the hospital received PEP grants, the Community of Camper their community hall was in sad need, in dire need of repairs and additions because of the lack of local resources to be able to generate funds to give them an adequate place to meet and hold the functions. This program has immensely helped the rural areas and as well has benefitted the people, some of whom have been on social allowances and some of whom have been underemployed. These programs have assisted them in getting some dollars over and above social assistance and have created meaningful jobs.

The STEP Program for instance that's in effect now, there are two portions or two parts to the STEP Program. Of course the original STEP program, Community STEP, that has been announced and applications I believe are now in from the various communities and high schools throughout the province in which there will be clean-up programs; all sorts of community betterment programs will fall under this program. And as well, the second portion, the rural STEP which will give an opportunity for many of our high school and university graduates a chance to be employed on farms and assist the farmers in projects that he would not normally undertake.

But getting down to the crux of the resolution, the member, the Leader of the Opposition indicates that there should be an annual publication of complete accounts of programs. Well the Estimates have now been debated for 85 hours plus another 50 minutes today and the members have every and full opportunity of seeking detailed information on these programs if they wanted to question them. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa shakes his head in the negative. I don't know what questions you want to ask but I can certainly say that you've expended 85 hours and you've had questions, you know. The opportunity is there to seek all information necessary with these programs. But I'm sure, I'm sure that if, you know, each and every member who on the opposite side if he's representing his constituency well, he is well aware of what programs are in effect and what type of grants each community in his area is receiving. If he is, shall we say, on top of the programs he would be aware of which community in his area gets the LIP grant or is applying for the LIP grant and the PEP grant and the STEP grants and the like, then he would be able to have all this information at his fingertips.

In the resolved portion the Leader of the Opposition indicates that this Assembly consider the advisability of seeking the annual publication of complete accounts of programs in which the Provincial Government is financially or administratively involved. Now if you accept that verbiage sort of carte blanche you then should say that all the programs like Medicare, any other programs, the Motor Vehicle Branch or the License Issuance Branch of

RESOLUTION NO. 11

(MR. URUSKI cont'd). . . . Department of Highways, those programs may be the complete information with respect to employees and moneys that are -- are they suggesting that all this type of information be made available? For instance, even say under Medicare, should all the information as for the doctors of the programs that we're involved in -- should that be brought out completely in the open? Possibly the programs or the money that the government is granting to the universities whether or not there should be a complete breakdown of every departmental or every class that receives some type of assistance. Maybe that should be published. I'm not sure. Maybe that's the 'etc.' that the Leader of the Opposition mentions because all he shows is PEP and STEP.

I can sincerely say that I would hope that, and I think I'm correct in saying, I would hope that the Department of Colleges and Universities who administer the STEP program I would think that they should be in consultation with the Federal opportunities for youth people to make sure that there is no duplication of grants to the various communities. I think this is carried out. Some communities will receive a STEP grant from the province and other communities will receive an opportunities for Youth grant from the Federal Government, so that there can be a general spreading over of the program so that most communities, or practically every community can benefit and the young people from those communities could take advantage of the existing projects that they may apply for. It's really on their own initiative that these programs can be developed, and I say to them that if they're unhappy with the initiative of the rural areas I think they've got another think coming. I think the ideas of programs and the like that are coming out of many communities is fantastic. The people are just waiting, and have been waiting for programs like this to utilize their resources and secondly, create employment. So that I don't think there is a lack of initiative on many of the local communities. They are taking full advantage of it.

When the two departments, and I just lost my train of thought, the departments that were handling the PEP program, I am sure that the PEP program was coincided as well with the Federal's LIP program so that communities that had benefitted or were going to benefit from a LIP grant which was granting for labour costs over \$15,000.00, the PEP program would try and dovetail this program to other communities which had smaller projects, so that again the program could be spread out throughout the province and so that as many communities and as many projects could be funded so that the employment rate as it has been shown is the second lowest in the Dominion of Canada. These programs, especially the PEP were a direct benefit on the employment rate in the country. As well, it assisted in -- the people who funded or looked after these programs were cognizant of the fact that there were people on social allowances and those people were given preference or they were encouraged to seek employment on these programs, and I know in my area that many people who could not normally find work who were on social allowances did find jobs on these programs. I think it helped them immensely; it you know, lifted their spirits. They felt that they were needed and they could walk proudly and say, I've earned it, I had a job. And they had money in the pocket and then the money circulated in the community. And you know, the beneficial effects of these programs--I certainly can say that it was immense to all the rural areas.

Now I don't know exactly how the honourable members are--what they are trying to get at, what the leader is trying to get at. What does he really want? If he wants to ask questions on specific programs or projects, I think specific questions can be put. I don't know--you know, as I mentioned before, if the members on his side of the House are really looking after their areas they should be aware of which communities get the grants and it's not very hard to put two and two together and where the money went. Now the total funding of course is reported in the Estimates for these type of programs, and the Capital acceleration programs and the like. The Premier introduced the Capital Estimates just the other day and, you know, you people who are the Opposition passed them in one afternoon. I'm surprised, that if you have such a burning desire of information on specific programs that you would have debated those Capital Estimates hours on end. But I am not sure as to really what you want, what you seem to accomplish.

If the "etc." means something that I am not aware of or includes some wide group I'd like to hear from you people as to what you really want. I think maybe the Estimate book should be changed to provide some additional detail in it. But I'm not sure what they want; I'd be willing to hear.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Speaker, and a word of thanks too to the Honourable House Leader, Acting House Leader, the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George seems unduly sensitive it seems to me with respect to the use of the term ad hoc in this resolution. No one is suggesting that resolutions and proposals and suggestions from local authorities, local municipal officials are not desirable. Such suggestions are entirely welcome as much by this party as by any in this House and the inference drawn by the Member for St. George that the use of the term ad hoc means that these local authorities are not confident to come forward with proposals for spending programs in the areas referred to, seems to be an unfortunate one, because I feel confident, on behalf of my leader, the mover of this resolution that there is no such inference intended, no such insinuation intended in the resolution.

The member has referred to the fact that in Capital Spending Estimates the total appropriations for programs of this type are available to us, and that's true. But totals are one thing, Mr. Speaker, totals are one thing in the area of government spending, specifics are another, and I think it's logical, eminently logical to anybody looking at the kind of use of the taxpayer's money that's involved in programs of this kind to assume that detailed specific scrutiny and examination of those appropriations is desirable. The sense and the direction of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is entirely on the level of and in the direction of accountability for public spending. It's entirely compatible with everything that we have asked in this Legislature in the area of disclosure, government disclosure to the public of the details of the spending programs for which they're responsible. And there's nothing inconsistent whatever with the request contained in my leader's resolution and with the arguments that we have advanced in this area in this Legislature.

The Member for St. George I think would agree that we have asked for the fullest possible disclosure and accountability consistent with the open-government theme that the present government professes to follow, and not on merely one occasion. We've asked again and again for this type of government disclosure and all this resolution does is underline that basic approach, that basic request that we have forwarded to them.

The resolution itself contains no criticism whatever of local authorities, municipal officials who are developing initiative programs in their area. It contains nothing but realism from a government point of view. And I think it's an eminently reasonable and responsible resolution for an Opposition to bring before a Legislature. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for St. George were sitting on this side of the House rather than the government side of the House he would agree that this is the type of resolution that an Opposition should introduce in a Chamber. This is the kind of thing that an Opposition should be asking for. What else is the exercise all about? There's really no difference in what my leader is requesting in the resolution before us, no difference between that and the exercise of the examination of departmental Estimates. There's no difference in essence between those two exercises. It's a primary, the primary responsibility of the Opposition to scrutinize government spending. It's the primary responsibility of the government to assume the most conscientious control over spending. And this resolution dovetails with both those ambitions and both those courses of action. There's nothing wrong with this kind of scrutiny, there's nothing wrong with this kind of disclosure; and on the contrary, Sir, it seems to me to reflect the essence or the reason for the Legislative process that we're all involved in.

Now the Member for St. George has said there are some excellent programs that have come forward at the local level and there are some excellent initiatives, with which we on this side fully concur. That there's nothing in this resolution that would preclude that, Sir. There's nothing here that will in any way inhibit local authorities and local governmental bodies from proceeding to inject the initiative in terms of program development that they have exercised and demonstrated in the past. And there's nothing here that precludes the possibility of such programs and such initiatives being accepted and being funded by the Provincial Government. All this says is that when you come down to the actual operation of the program itself, to the actual dispensation and distribution of the taxpayer's money that's involved in the funding of the programs, that the taxpayer through the Legislature, through the accepted role of the Opposition has a right to scrutinize that spending down indeed to the dotting of the final "i"

RESOLUTION NO. 11

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) and the final crossing of the "t". There are worthwhile initiatives and worthwhile programs coming forward no doubt in regular government departmental operations but the Member for St. George doesn't suggest that we on this side shouldn't have the right to scrutinize the detailed spending connected with them. He doesn't for one moment suggest that we don't have the right to look at every specific minute detail of spending in the Department of Health and Social Development or the Department of Labour or the Department of Highways or the Department of Finance or any other department for which he and his colleagues as the members of the government of this province are responsible. So why does he get so up tight over the request for the Opposition's right to be recognized in a parallel capacity which is all this resolution seeks. After all, Mr. Speaker, it's the taxpayer's money, just as much as it's the taxpayer's money going - the regular government departmental spending programs, and the taxpayer expects us in the Opposition to scrutinize the directions in which his money is being spent.

So I wish to support the resolution proposed by my leader and commend it to the government benches, and especially to the Member for St. George who I think is reading into it, Sir, something that is not intended to be there. The term ad hoc is not a dirty word, it's not a reflection on the wisdom or the competence of the local authorities and the local community boards with whom he's concerned. We're as much concerned with them. All that is meant here by the term ad hoc is that these are programs that have to some degree been developed in quasi-official ways or semi-official ways to meet specific emergencies and meet specific needs. They are not programs that perhaps have been built into government planning in the classic sense. Rather they are programs that are constructed to meet specific situations which were not anticipated and which could not have been forecast.

That's all that's meant by the term and I would hope that the Member for St. George would not read any hostility or any suspicion or any unpleasantness into it because there is none intended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a few words on the resolution itself.

I think that the development of the Winter Works Program in the Province of Manitoba PEP specifically has recognized the type of province which we are, a province in which employment seasonally adjusts according to climatic conditions. And for too long there have been situations where unemployment rose, still rises, during the winter months and is less during the summer period. But certainly this impact has been greater in Manitoba than in many other province of Canada. I think therefore that the government takes substantial satisfaction from the fact that Manitoba has the lowest rate of unemployment, according to last month's statistics, of any province in Canada. And I say this, that the contribution by the development of the Winter Works Program to insure this as a certainty, that Manitoba should rank the lowest should go without saying. Certainly as has been indicated by other speakers, sometimes a little on the critical side, if the PEP programs did not exist Manitoba's rate would be much higher. Certainly it would be. But it has been the creation of jobs in order to insure that vitally needed social services within various, especially rural communities, often long neglected, are taken care of.

The resolution before us requests the annual publication of complete account of programs in which the Provincial Government is financially or administratively involved. Just so that we can be very clear on this, I know of no instance which an honourable member can point to in which this government has not been very open insofar as any project or undertaking is concerned involving provincial employment programs. Just no example that I'm aware of where this government has not been very open, whether it comes by way of an order for return or whether it comes as a result of a request for information from a member of the Legislature to the Minister responsible for the program, I think that the government has always bended over backwards to insure that the fullest and the most complete information is provided. And therefore, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that because of this attitude of openness and fairness with good intent has been demonstrated by this government in respect to its Winter Works Program that probably this program ranks among the top five programs in popularity in the minds of the people of the Province of Manitoba at the present time. If this government had been less than open, less than fair in its dealings then certainly that would not be the case.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) And we would want to continue along that path of fairness, and let me add, equity in our dealings. Let me say this, I recall a couple of years ago during estimate review and I believe we were in a position to do it again during my estimate review, of tabling in the House the distribution of moneys as per the provincial employment program among the various areas and parts of Manitoba. And I recall at the time that if you averaged out the moneys allocated by way of constituencies I believe the average by honourable members across the way surpassed the average of constituencies represented by government members which I think demonstrates more than anything the total and complete non-political generosity of this government in its dealings. --(Interjection)-- That's right. Because it is the concern of this government that those, that those that are first, that those of course that are without jobs do not be deprived of the opportunity to work in order to ensure that they can continue with some dignity in the way of their life. And at the same time as that is being done to ensure that a social result is obtained. And I don't think there is very many communities left in Manitoba that you can travel to without seeing some degree of impact as a result of the government's efforts in its Winter Works Program.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, this, that other provinces have watched with interest that which has been done by this province by way of Winter Works Programs. I can recall the Conference of Municipal Affairs Ministers held last year when there was a discussion of Winter Works Programs and those that represented other provinces did look to Manitoba as having probably the best Winter Works Program anywhere in Canada and I believe that as a result of our activity here other provinces have followed suit and certainly the Federal Government has moved a long way in the direction of attempting to pattern their own LIP program after many of the innovations that this government developed by way of its Winter Works Program.

So let me do this. Say first that this government attempts at all times to be fair and open. Two, that we look to the local people to indicate to this government on a local basis the people and the locality or the village or the town themselves to say what project is most socially useful in their midst. This government does not direct local people what they are to do, we take directions from local people as to what social program is best in their areas, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities have been very deeply involved in this program. Every program that is approved at the provincial level receives the endorsement, the endorsement of the municipality. So let me say that when there is criticism of a Winter Works Program it implies not only a criticism of the province as such in a particular project but it must carry with it the criticism of the judgment of the local people. And let me say that during the last four years I have found that there probably is none that is more familiar, more aware of the needs of people within their midst than municipal councillors. I think probably that one of the strengths of this program has been the fact that we have relied upon the judgment value of municipal councillors just as much as it is at all possible.

The resolution itself therefore, I see nothing wrong with it. It simply requests the continuation really of a policy which is already in practice, making available information. If it's information as to the type of project, the number of hours involved by way of the Winter Works Program, in respect to that project, the amount of money that is expended for labour in the program, the number of people that are taken off the social assistance or the unemployment roles to be involved in that program, the location of the program, all this information would be made readily available. I think that possibly even honourable members on this side of the House would like to see this information in an organized way so that it's a little easier to obtain and I see no reason that we would want to object to the approval of this resolution before the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . statements the Minister of Municipal Affairs just made because I don't think there was any intention to criticize the plan. It was just a publication. I remember well that you did give us a list a year ago, and I guess my Leader thought that this may be on an annual basis and thought it should be. I think it's right that public moneys when they are expended that some record should be--because I know, as the Member for St. George said, what's being spent in my area. But I don't know how much is being spent in the province and we do have to - we come in here, pass moneys for all parts of the Province of Manitoba and I agree that it is better that we have a publication. I think we're the last ones,

RESOLUTION NO. 11

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) because I remember I think back in the early 1960's, Winter Works Programs were initiated by the Federal Government at that time, the John Diefenbaker Government and our government and they were well needed at that time and prosperity came along and now we're back into the same unemployment, high unemployment rates across Canada as we had at that time and these programs do help assist the people who have no jobs during the winter months. This is one of the unfortunate parts about our provinces here, that many of the people in Manitoba are employed for summer employment only and they need something to look after that four or five months during the winter that they have no job or no position. Because it's nice to see construction going on in our province, and especially this weather when construction could be accommodated because of the mild winter that we did have.

Now I don't know, other than to say that at the International Peace Gardens we have taken advantage of this program during the last two or three years, the PEP program, and employ people that are employed during the summer months to work there during the winter. Many of the programs that are initiated there in the winter months are repair and maintenance of all our facilities and we are grateful for these moneys which help our budget during the summer months.

So Mr. Speaker, because of the fact nobody's listening to me on the government side, I might as well sit down and hope that everybody will stand up and vote for this resolution because I think it's worthy and needs the support that it deserves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thanks, Mr. Speaker, Well up to this point I think everyone has been in agreement with this resolution. It's a very commonsense one I believe and it's simply a disclosure of the fact that moneys have been spent and how they have been spent. So, basically we have to get around to the reason for these programs and which of course has got to be unemployment. And I thought that with the explanations from the government over the period of time that they've been in that a lot of the reasons would have been taken care of. We find that in my own particular area that there are going to be 50 more people unemployed as of the end of this week. So I would hope that this program continues --(Interjection)-- Because of relocation of an industry, and no new ones coming in.

One of the things that I would have to take into consideration here, Mr. Speaker, would be the fact that this group of people that are unemployed are possibly going to develop into another group that are going to be kind of a continuous process, that they will not be seeking jobs, they'll be waiting for programs to develop and most of the time these programs are very beneficial to the communities. I think the programs up to this point have been good and I don't think that they have been abused. The Minister of Municipal Affairs said that he felt that we had received as much benefit or more than the government has and I'd think I'd be inclined to agree with him. My constituency has been treated very fairly. I would hope that it would continue to operate in this manner. I don't think that the most that can be said has been said about this, Mr. Speaker. I was expecting somebody from the other side to come up with a nonsensical amendment which they haven't done and possibly this resolution is going to be allowed to go through and in its present state. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I wouldn't like to disappoint the Member for Gladstone, but the Member for Roblin disappointed me. He spoke on Wednesday; we don't speak until Friday.

But, Mr. Speaker, in just addressing a few comments to this resolution, this in my view is part of the dilemma that we as members face. It's the difficulty in obtaining information on government programs in our constituencies. Last year during the discussion of the Estimates under legislation relative to the amount of money which was being allocated to two agencies of government, one the Management Committee and the other the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet, where they're spending some \$5 millions and I don't know what it is this year. It is making it more and more difficult for individual members to be fully conversant with what is taking place in their individual constituencies. So I for one would support this particular resolution because I think it may be of benefit to us all.

I was a little surprised though, in all seriousness, relative to the Member for Gladstone's comment that he thought maybe some member would come up with a silly amendment. I wasn't too sure when I saw this on the order paper whether the motion itself or the resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 11

(MR. BOYCE cont;d) itself was in order, because of course it calls for this legislature to pass a resolution which if accepted commits the government to expenditures of funds. But of course that may be just a technicality, nevertheless being a fundamentalist I think it's rather sloppy.

But in just addressing these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go on the record as supporting this resolution, and also to perhaps encourage my colleagues to consider that after we get rid of such things as elections and even if I am not here - I hope to return after the next election - but even if I'm not here I would suggest to honourable members that really they have to come up with a better system of keeping themselves informed.

I had suggested three years ago, and of course when I stood up everybody used to laugh because here he goes again beating his drum for the Human Resource Research Council, that the type of information that is asked for in this resolution is exactly what I was talking about then, that information or data, raw data, raw information which is compiled by governments should automatically be placed in the public domain. That we shouldn't have to ask for this type of information, that it should be there for any member or any person in the province to have access to. Because what is occurring, Mr. Speaker, is that as governments get bigger and more complex they control more and more information. Well I have faith in my colleagues and I think when all is said and done and we get down to the basis, I think this is true of even members opposite, that they don't think that anyone in this government or in this House at the present time would be surreptitious and trying to hide information, but nevertheless the vulnerability of societies today to governments and the control of information by governments, is well demonstrated to the south of us. I don't want to drag in a Watergate affair into debates of the Manitoba Legislature but nevertheless it does demonstrate the vulnerability of society to governments. So that when the hurly-burly's done and the battles lost and won that perhaps this House could address themselves to setting up a system whereby the members could keep themselves better informed.

We passed a piece of legislation two years ago which allocated some \$500.00 to each individual member to try and set up a research or information gathering system for each individual member, which is really nothing when you think that what you're doing is pitting \$500.00 as an individual member against \$5 million as a government in trying to keep yourself informed. In looking across the country I find that in Ontario, for example, my colleagues in Ontario, who number some 18, are given an operational budget of some \$191,000.00.

--(Interjection)-- There's my conservative Minister of Labour. You know, you try and get a secretary from him and it's like pulling teeth.

But nevertheless I fully sympathize with members opposite because being in a back-bench--well I've never had a Minister refuse to give me any information nevertheless to know the question to ask is difficult because many times you don't find anything out until after it's done. I would hate to quote you one, two, three, the things that have occurred, but nevertheless this does happen. So that when we're talking about this publication of moneys, I think what is implicit in it is a need for members of the Legislature to be more informed about what is going on.

So that while I will support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would repeat that after the next election, and perhaps during the next session, that the members could address themselves to perhaps strengthening the ability of individual members to have some type of meaningful information provided to them by an agency, or some structure, which is really not part of government. I repeat while I trust this government, nevertheless there is the remote possibility that some other group might form government some day that I might not be willing to trust, and that I too then would be in a position where I would like to be better informed.

It's becoming more and more apparent as society has become more and more complex that Rothstein's suggestion that, you know, if he controlled the economic wealth of a country he didn't care what political group was in control.

A MEMBER: Is that Dave Rothstein?

MR. BOYCE: No, No, No. I hear Dave is selling his hotel. --(Interjection)-- Another one. Yes, it is in the hub of the universe. But his suggestion that if he controlled the economic wealth of a country, he could control the country; this has been changed to those people that control the information in a country, control the country, and that we make ourselves more and more vulnerable if we do not strengthen all members of this Legislature in their ability

RESOLUTION NO. 11

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)to keep better informed with that which is taking place in their constituencies.

And in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like it to be on the record that the Member for Lakeside spends much of his time devising techniques whereby he can divert me from my purpose, and on this particular occasion he's hidden my speaking notes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution? (Agreed)
So ordered.

We call it the adjournment hour?

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)